



No 9335. v. 206



pp. 1-3

GIVEN BY





STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM  
(THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MATUSOW CASE)

---

---

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

~~Congress.~~  
~~Senate.~~ COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 58**

---

FEBRUARY 28, 1955

---

**PART 3**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1955

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
PRICE DANIEL, Texas	HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming	JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina	WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas	ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri	HERMAN WELKER, Idaho
PRICE DANIEL, Texas	JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

J. G. SOURWINE, *Chief Counsel*

RICHARD ARENS and ALVA C. CARPENTER, *Associate Counsels*  
BENJAMIN N. MANDEL, *Director of Research*

## TESTIMONY RELATING TO HARVEY M. MATUSOW

---

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL  
SECURITY LAWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:35 p. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, Senator James O. Eastland (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland, Johnston of South Carolina, McClellan, Hennings, Daniel, and Welker.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Alva C. Carpenter, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Robert C. McManus, professional staff member.

Senator JOHNSTON (presiding). The hearing will come to order. The witness will raise his right hand and take the oath.

Do you swear that the evidence you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do.

### TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS ATTORNEY, STANLEY FAULKNER—Resumed

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, we were talking about your testimony with respect to Clinton Jencks the last time you were on the stand.

Did you ever discuss with Clinton Jencks your chapter, the chapter of your book, on the Jencks case or your affidavit in the Jencks case?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss either your chapter of the book or your affidavit in this case with any persons other than Mr. Cameron, Mr. Kahn, Mr. Nathan Witt, and the attorney for Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever discuss either your chapter on the Jencks case or your affidavit in that case with any officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not hear the end of your question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Any officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you inform the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Clinton Jencks is or was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe at some time or another I did that.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you did that, was it, to your knowledge, an untruth?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not hear that statement.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you informed the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Clinton Jencks is or was a Communist, was that, to your knowledge, an untruth?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you name other individuals to the FBI as Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall at this time. I might have.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were making reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you have congressional immunity?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were making reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you have congressional immunity?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. It has been stated that your testimony at all times and your information at all times in the naming of individuals as Communists was under congressional immunity. That is not so, is it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not familiar with that aspect of the law. I presume, no, but I don't know.

Senator JOHNSTON. Does the witness object to this lighting [indicating floodlights and spotlights]?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you gave information to the FBI, Mr. Matusow, what was your purpose in giving that information?

Mr. MATUSOW. The purpose was to report on activities of people I knew.

Mr. SOURWINE. No; not what you did—but what your purpose was in doing it.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my answer to your question, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, did you have any purpose to aid your country in exposing Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any purpose to make financial gain for yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it your purpose to deceive the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I presume you are referring to the period of my membership in the Communist Party, when I was reporting to the FBI?

Mr. SOURWINE. That is correct.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, if it was your purpose, sir, at that time, to serve your country by helping to expose Communists, as you have said it was, and if it was not your purpose at that time to deceive the FBI, as you have said it was not, why do you now say that information which you gave the FBI at that time was false?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say all the information was false. I don't know which information was true or false. I haven't seen those reports, but at this time I realize, I believe I am serving my country

a lot better by exposing the informer racket and the people who do give false information.

I have nothing against the FBI or their evaluation of facts, but when they base their facts upon irresponsible people, such as I have been in the past, and Mr. Crouch, and Mr. Budenz, and they are doing something harmful and false, then I think it is my job as a citizen to expose them.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. You are not speaking for other witnesses now. Mr. Chairman, he should be advised not to speak as to others except as to what this witness may know as to facts within his knowledge, not what other witnesses have said.

Senator JOHNSTON. Will you please confine your remarks to things of your own knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I do know something of my own knowledge about Mr. Crouch.

Senator JOHNSTON. You testify concerning yourself, not Mr. Crouch.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Before we leave the question of Clinton Jeneks, may I inquire of you, Mr. Matusow, who that gentleman is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Clinton Jeneks, is a member and, I presume, still is a leader of the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Union.

Senator WELKER. When and where did you first meet him?

Mr. MATUSOW. In the summer of 1950, at San Cristobal, N. Mex.

Senator WELKER. When did you last see him?

Mr. MATUSOW. During the month of January 1954, when he was a defendant in the trial I testified in.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were advance copies of your book sent to any point behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the daily report of foreign radio broadcasts from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, which is No. 38, for 1955, on page GD-3. This report refers to a broadcast which was monitored from the Poland Home Service, Warsaw, on February 20, 1955.

It indicates that in that broadcast, the publisher of the Matusow book was lauded as showing great courage. It shows that the Polish announcer, broadcasting from that station behind the Iron Curtain, reviewed in detail the book *False Witness*, by Harvey Matusow, and, after having described the difficulties connected with its publication, then turned to a discussion of the Rosenberg case.

I would like to offer that for the record,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Chairman, and I would like to ask Mr. Matusow:

Can you, sir, explain, if no copies of your books were sent behind the Iron Curtain, how it happens that a Polish radio announcer over a Communist station behind the Iron Curtain was able to review that book fully on February 20 of this year?

<sup>1</sup> The document was numbered "Exhibit No. 10" and is in the subcommittee's files.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said I have no knowledge of any copy of the book going behind the Iron Curtain, whether it went or did not go. Apparently it did, but I still have no knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. In view of the fact it was reviewed on the 20th of February, is it not true that at least one copy went back behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume so.

Senator WELKER. One question, Mr. Chairman.

Did you inquire of your publishers, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn, as to whether or not any of the copies of your book went behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I made no such inquiry.

Senator WELKER. Yet they were financing you, and you had made a deal with them?

Mr. MATUSOW. They are book publishers, and I am a writer, and that is our arrangement.

Senator WELKER. How many books have you written prior to this?

Mr. MATUSOW. A volume of poetry.

Senator WELKER. How was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. A volume of poetry.

Senator WELKER. A volume of poetry.

Mr. MATUSOW. And one that Gipson was about to publish——

Senator WELKER. About to publish?

Mr. MATUSOW. Was at one time; was considering it.

Senator WELKER. He is not going to publish it now, is he?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so. He does not have the manuscript any more.

Senator WELKER. Now, I did not interrogate you when you appeared before the committee heretofore. I would like to ask, as background—and I am sorry if this is repetitious—as to just why you decided to tell the truth in any matter, as you claim?

Mr. MATUSOW. There are many reasons, sir. The main reason is my conscience.

Senator WELKER. Your conscience?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And I think I read in the press wherein you had gone to some bishop and conversed with him, to get relief for your conscience.

Mr. MATUSOW. I had conversed with the bishop——

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, while you were in the armed services and the Air Force of the United States, you went to the minister of the gospel, did you not, the chaplain of your base?

Mr. MATUSOW. At many times in my life I have gone to see men of God, and I believe my conversations with those men is a matter of privilege which I am not going to discuss.

Senator WELKER. And you went some years ago, 1951——

Mr. MATUSOW. And in 1931, and including my childhood——

Senator WELKER. In 1950 or 1951 you advised with your chaplain at the Air Force base, I think, at Brooks Field; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe, first, Brooks Air Force and Wright-Patterson, and two fields in New York City——

Senator WELKER. And he told you to meet some people; isn't that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. He didn't tell me; he suggested I meet with some people.

Senator WELKER. And they would relieve your conscience, or help you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe you got the story a little bit backwards.

Senator WELKER. Well, I may go into that a little fuller.

You were a pretty bad boy, weren't you, at one time, when you were in the Air Force?

Mr. MATUSOW. How do you mean—angry?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Why were you mad, angry, and—

Mr. MATUSOW. I wasn't mad; I was angry.

Senator WELKER. Why?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I thought I could do a lot more for my country than I was doing in this country, and I had no knowledge that my mother sent the letter to the Air Force, requesting my staying in the United States, and I wanted to serve overseas during the Korea and the Air Force continuously—

Senator WELKER. As Air Force personnel, there were forms that you had to fill out, you were asked if you belonged to any subversive organization and notwithstanding the fact, according to your book, as I read it last night for the first time, you had been instructed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to communicate with the Air Force orally and not in writing—

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Senator WELKER. You listed 46, or 45 Communist fronts you belonged to, and the Communist Party; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Counsel for the committee seems to dispute that fact, but it was approximately that number. I stated 45 or 46 in the book, sir, yes.

Senator WELKER. You stated 45 or 46 in the book, and that is what I am questioning on.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Not from counsel; I have not talked with him about it.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, I think you stated in your book you wanted to be cute when you did that. Can you tell us why you wanted to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea at the time why I wanted to be cute, but that was the attitude then.

Senator WELKER. Do you have any idea why you wanted to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I am being cute; I am being very serious.

Senator WELKER. Well, you said you wanted to be cute; why did you want to be cute?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection of why.

Senator WELKER. You have no recollection.

Now, as a matter of fact, did you not make a statement in your book that you did this 180-degree turn solely to get even with the Air Force of the United States?

Mr. MATUSOW. What 180-degree turn are you referring to?

Senator WELKER. What is it then, 360 degrees?

Mr. MATUSOW. What turn are you referring to; what part of the book? I don't recall that statement.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, I will quote from page 47 of your book.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Next to the last paragraph on page 47:

"I made up my mind then"—I beg your pardon, sir. I will find the citation as to the exact page. I am apparently wrong with respect to the page.

Mr. MATUSOW. Might I suggest that there is a mention of 360 degrees, or 180 degrees, I believe, in a first draft of an early preface I wrote, myself. You might have seen that, and might be referring to it.

Senator WELKER. No; what I am asking you about, Mr. Matusow, is whether you didn't get mad with the Air Force and decide to get even with the Air Force.

Mr. MATUSOW. I got mad at the Air Force bureaucracy. I thought the Air Force was not effectively fighting communism in an orientation or education way, and I thought I had something to contribute.

Senator WELKER. And you were at that time dedicated, then, to fighting for the free world against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I still am dedicated to fighting for the free world against communism.

Senator WELKER. Against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Against totalitarianism, communism, fascism, or any other ism.

Senator WELKER. Before I go further, I want to ask you whether or not you know a gentleman by the name of Herbert Tank.

Mr. MATUSOW. I do, sir.

Senator WELKER. How long have you known him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I met him formally in the month of January of this year.

Senator WELKER. The month of January of this year?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Although you are dedicated still to a fight against communism or any totalitarianism—

Mr. MATUSOW. Communism or fascism—

Senator WELKER. Now, just a moment, please.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you inquire of Mr. Tank whether he ever belonged to one of those organizations?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You did not feel free to do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. None of my business what anybody else's political belief. If they care to tell me, it is their position.

Senator WELKER. And yet in the past month, with the exception of 8 days, you have lived with him; is that not right?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might be 10 days.

Senator WELKER. Eight or 10 days?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I have been with him a lot.

Senator WELKER. And he has paid all of your expenses?

Mr. MATUSOW. Most of my expenses.

Senator WELKER. He has fed you and he has seen that you received lodging; is that a correct statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. The lodging, I believe, was taken care of by my apartment. At times when we were traveling out of New York City he took care of the hotel bills; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you know who it was that compensated Mr. Tank for any out-of-pocket money he may have spent?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume it was my publisher, but I didn't inquire.

Senator WELKER. You didn't inquire?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You didn't think that it was necessary to know whether or not you were running a bill to be charged against you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't run up big bills, and I don't have a conscience that bothers me—

Senator WELKER. You don't have a conscience that bothers you about big bills?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't run up big bills.

Senator WELKER. I see. But yet you don't know who was furnishing Mr. Tank with the money?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, in my past life I was very snoopy and nosy; I am not that way any more.

Senator WELKER. Not very snoopy?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. What was the business of Mr. Tank in his association with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Many things.

Senator WELKER. What?

Mr. MATUSOW. One, he is working on a play.

Senator WELKER. Working on a play?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Based on this book or yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. Based on certain experiences I had; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is that all that he—

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I said that was one reason.

He was also—Mr. Tank has also been with me because we felt, that is, Mr. Tank and I and my publishers, that because of the controversy which was stirred up after I filed or gave the attorneys to file affidavits in two cases, and the announcement of my book was coming out, it would be best to have somebody with me—

Senator WELKER. That was to keep you from being assaulted or attacked by crackpots?

Mr. MATUSOW. In fact, sir, I got crackpot letters and—

Senator WELKER. And also the members of the committee have received such letters; in the last 4 years that I have been here I have; but have you ever feared for your life by virtue of those crackpot letters?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did up to a point, but I believe now it is a matter of public responsibility and trust, just the same type of public responsibility and trust that you have, sir, and that is the reason nobody attacks Members of the United States—or very seldom attempt to attack a Congressman; but at one point that situation was not so with me.

Senator WELKER. Now, did this gentleman, Mr. Tank, ever help edit this book called the *False Witness*?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Senator WELKER. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I can only speak of my knowledge, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, certainly, you had access to the book all the time—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and every sentence in that book was mine.

Senator WELKER. It was your own writing, or dictated by you?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you mean to say he had no part whatsoever in helping you edit the book; are we—

Mr. MATUSOW. Now, wait a minute, sir. Here is what I want to say.

He did not edit the book to my knowledge. In the last few days of correcting galley proofs of this book—you edit grammatics and only grammatics, not substance—Mr. Tank might have, I don't know if he did—might have made some corrections in relation to grammar.

Senator WELKER. Now, my concluding question before I give this matter back to counsel:

As a matter of fact, you accused Mr. Tank at one time of being a Communist, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; he, among other people.

Senator WELKER. And you changed your conclusion on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I called Mr. Tank a member of the Communist Party, I had no knowledge of such membership.

Senator WELKER. You had no knowledge of such membership?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had no knowledge.

Senator WELKER. Now, since you have been traveling around the country and since he has been your bodyguard—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe the term "bodyguard" is right.

Senator WELKER. I will do the questioning, and you can correct me later.

He has been your friend, a man to protect you against crackpots, violence—

Mr. MATUSOW. I think you are going a little too far—violence—I think you are trying to create an impression that does not exist.

Senator WELKER. We will take care of that question, too, later.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever ask Mr. Tank after once accusing him of being a member of the Communist Party whether or not in fact he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not, sir, and I state again—it is none of my business.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever told him you were humbly sorry for accusing him, prior to meeting him last January?

Mr. MATUSOW. I told Mr. Tank I was sorry for falsely accusing him. I said, "You might or might not be, but I don't care if you are or aren't."

Senator WELKER. In other words, you say you are still dedicated to the fight for the free world against communism and all these other isms?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Senator WELKER. You still don't care whether a man who has been living with you for all except 8 or 10 days for the past month,

whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party; is that a correct statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't care one way or another, sir. It is none of my business.

Senator WELKER. None of your business?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you want to change your statement about you being still dedicated in the fight against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Let a war start with the United States fighting any aggressor and see how fast I get into service, and I think that will answer the question. I volunteered once, and I will volunteer—

Senator WELKER. How did you get out of the last one?

Mr. MATUSOW. Honorably.

Senator WELKER. Honorably. But you had to make a deal, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. What are you talking about?

Senator WELKER. According to your book, you stated by mutual agreement with the Air Corps and you—

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my discharge from the Air Force Reserve, not separation from active duty.

Senator WELKER. When were you separated?

Mr. MATUSOW. If you would like the exact date, I will give it to you.

Senator WELKER. I would like to have it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will give the date for my separation from active duty, and let the committee check on it and put an end to this nonsense.

Honorable separation from active duty, United States Air Force, active duty from March 1, 1951, to December 11, 1951.

Senator WELKER. I have not stated you were not honorably discharged. I am merely stating a remark made by you in your so-called book here, called *False Witness*, in which it was stated, and I read it last night, about mutual agreement between you, Mr. Witness, and the Air Force; you were discharged from the Air Force.

Mr. MATUSOW. And there is another honorable discharge [exhibiting]; that is from the infantry in World War II.

Senator WELKER. I have read all that, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir; keep the record straight on it, that is all.

Senator WELKER. I will turn the witness back to counsel.

Senator DANIEL. Along that same line of questioning, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSTON. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. I understood you to say that you thought Tank was a Communist; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my surmise, one time.

Senator DANIEL. And you thought that the other day, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said when I accused him of it, I thought he was a Communist, but I didn't know.

Senator DANIEL. And the other day, the last time I heard you testify, didn't you say you still thought he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know; might have. I would like to see the record on that.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't you tell the committee you thought your publisher, Angus Cameron, was a member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I doubt that, sir.

**Senator DANIEL.** Do you now deny you told this committee you thought your publisher—

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I don't either confirm or deny; I would like to see the record.

**Senator DANIEL.** Did you or did you not deny to this committee you thought your publisher, Angus Cameron, was a Communist or member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I would like to see the record before I answer that question, sir. I don't have any recollection of the testimony.

**Senator DANIEL.** Well, what is the truth about the case? Don't you think your publisher, Angus Cameron, is a member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I don't know, sir, and I don't care.

**Senator DANIEL.** I ask you what your thought is about it.

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I just told you, sir; I don't know and don't care.

**Senator DANIEL.** You don't know and don't care?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** That is right, sir.

**Senator DANIEL.** Don't you think now your publisher, Mr. Kahn, is a member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I don't know, sir; I haven't given much thought to it.

**Senator DANIEL.** What is your belief and thought about your publisher, Mr. Kahn, being a member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I say, I haven't given much thought to it.

**Senator DANIEL.** None whatever?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I don't know one way or another.

**Senator DANIEL.** What is your present belief about Mr. Herb Tank being a member of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I state again, sir, I don't know and don't care.

**Senator DANIEL.** Don't know and don't care?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** That is right.

**Senator DANIEL.** You have no idea whether he is or not?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** My relationship with people is based on the basis of friendship and not political belief.

**Senator DANIEL.** And you want this committee to believe you are still against the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I am against communism and all "isms."

**Senator DANIEL.** And not caring one way or another as to whether the man you lived with most of the time, or your publisher, or—

**Mr. MATUSOW.** Sir, the Bible teaches me to be against sins and not sinners, don't forget—it is the teaching of all religions.

**Senator DANIEL.** You want this committee to believe you are telling the truth now?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I know I am telling the truth, and I want this committee to believe it.

**Senator DANIEL.** You are against the Communist Party and the Communist conspiracy, although you don't care whether your publishers and the man living with you are members of the Communist Party?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I said I am against the sin, not the sinner.

**Senator DANIEL.** I said, is that what you want the committee to believe?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** My statement is clear. Yes, sir, I am against the sin, not the sinner.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you consider membership in the Communist Party an intellectual pursuit?

Mr. MATUSOW. If we are going on that subject sir, look, I am not an expert on communism. Why do you want my opinion of communism?

Mr. SOURWINE. I want your opinion on that question, because you have at least twice here referred to the Communist Party as being a man's polities or how he thought, and I want to find out what state your mind is about it:

Do you consider Communist membership as merely a matter of belief or a matter of polities?

Mr. MATUSOW. Most of the Communists whom I have met in my life were intellectual Communists.

Mr. SOURWINE. That does not answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, that is my belief—

Mr. SOURWINE. Your belief is that most Communists are intellectual Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said, most Communists whom I knew as Communists, and that is the only realm about Communists I am talking about, American Communists—

Mr. SOURWINE. My question still remains:

Do you believe that being a Communist is merely a matter of intellectual belief?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no opinion one way or another on that. The only opinion I have is based on my own relationship with certain members of the Communist Party a number of years ago, and those whom I knew were Communists, for the most part, intellectually.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know, Mr. Matusow, that a member of the Communist Party is a member of a conspiracy to overthrow the governments of all countries—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well—

Mr. SOURWINE. Which are based on free enterprise?

Mr. MATUSOW. My knowledge of that question and the answer to it has been obtained through testimony such as mine from ex-Communists who are hungry for a dollar, and I wouldn't believe a word they say, and if I am going to base an opinion on a bunch of liars, as I had been in the past, it would be one opinion I wouldn't give credence to.

Senator WELKER. May I question on that line?

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. If I recall your testimony correctly, you have testified to familiarity with the force and violence passage in the Communist Manifesto; is that correct? Is that correct or false?

Mr. MATUSOW. Counsel asked me if I ever read that, and I stated "yes."

Senator WELKER. And you stated you were familiar with it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had read it, that was the answer; I believe I was familiar in that respect.

Mr. SOURWINE. And who are those people who believe in the force and violence clause of the manifesto—intellectuals?

Mr. MATUSOW. I say, the Communist Party members I knew were intellectual Communists. If you want to know them—they were not capable of violence.

Mr. SOURWINE. How is that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I didn't believe any of them were capable of violence. A bunch of 18- and 19-year-old kids.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't limit yourself to 18- or 19-year-old kids.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was in the Communist Youth, and I came into these committees and told a lot of tall tales, don't forget that.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am quite mindful of the tales you told, sir.

Have you met any kind of an adult member of the Communist Party

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you care to name them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Ask me about them and I will tell you.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. I am asking you. You told me you knew some adult members.

Now tell me who they were.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that I stated the other day, the national committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want the individuals.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, there were Eugene Dennis; Henry Winston; Gil Green; Bill Norman; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and a few others.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, do you remember having testified that you made, and I use your words, "about \$2," picking cotton on a farm in Texas while you were on your way to New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I believe I testified.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember how much you did make, in fact?

Mr. MATUSOW. Two dollars. I don't recall. It was in the vicinity of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, was it more or less?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the vaguest recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you had volunteered the amount in your previous testimony. I did not. You had volunteered the amount.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said it was in the vicinity of \$2; if it was \$2.20 or \$2.80, I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that the first time you had ever picked cotton?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How long did it take you to earn that approximately \$2?

Mr. MATUSOW. I worked through a good part of the day.

Mr. SOURWINE. I believe you said 6 or 7 hours.

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you had been up all night the night before?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say that. I said I didn't camp out. I believe I said I slept in a truck which I hitchhiked in.

Mr. SOURWINE. You don't know how long you slept?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I was not logging that trip.

Mr. SOURWINE. This trip—you said you were relaxing?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know, Mr. Matusow, that anybody who knows very much about picking cotton will find it incredible that you picked somewhere around 100 pounds of cotton in 6 or 7 hours the first time you ever tried it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say I picked 100 pounds of cotton.

Mr. SOURWINE. How much did you say you picked?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recollect.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you testify you were getting \$2.80 for 100 pounds?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. You are asking me a question about something which I just did for relaxation, as I called it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you a question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I don't know, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the witness be admonished to let the questions be asked and then to answer.

Senator JOHNSTON. Please let the attorney ask the question, and after you have answered the question, you will have ample opportunity to explain.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you, Mr. Matusow, about testimony you gave under oath during the past week.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I realize that; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, Mr. Matusow, ever get money from Nathan Witt or from his law firm at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I received a 25-cent good-luck token, and since then a 15-cent subway token.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever receive any other money from Nathan Witt or from his law firm at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you furnish the committee, sir, with an itemized account of all moneys received by you from Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would have to get that from the publisher. I will endeavor to do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean you have no records of your own?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the publishers are keeping adequate records. I don't have to.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is, whether you have records of your own.

Mr. MATUSOW. On that score, no, sir; not yet.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying, Mr. Matusow, you had a wire tape of conversations, conversations between you and Mr. Kahn, and tape recordings of conversations between Communist union leaders?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you still have the wire tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. I could endeavor to locate it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked if you still had it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. I will have to check. I have got over 200 hours of tape recordings, and I would have to play them to find out if I still had it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean you had an item like that and made no effort to put it in a safe place?

Mr. MATUSOW. That particular item, that is right, sir. No effort.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever give that wire or recording or a duplicate of it to a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be instructed if he still has it or if it is under his control, that particular recording be furnished to the committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will endeavor to, sir. I might suggest the easiest way to get it would be to contact Mr. Don Surine; I believe he still knows where the recording is. The last time I saw it—I turned the original over to him, it was played, and sent to McCarthy's office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you were the one that brought up the matter of that tape recording and testified, and the committee is attempting to secure a copy about which you testified.

Mr. MATUSOW. There were two copies. One I gave back, personally saw him place it in bookshelves with a number of others, and sent to McCarthy a dubbing of the original.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you will remember we had some discussion here the other day about the personal history statement you filled out.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you stated you had filled it out—filled out two such statements.

Mr. MATUSOW. Two or more.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, how many more?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you first fill one out?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I went to the Air Force.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, after I went in, in February, but I was still in reserve, and the active duty supposedly started March 1, so I was there a month earlier.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you filled out the first one in February or March of what year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you fill it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Brooks Air Force, at San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not fill out a personal history statement for the Air Force before that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection. I might have, though.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you fill out the second?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe on the other, at Kirtland Air Force, at Albuquerque. The Air Force might turn up another one. That was prior to going on active duty.

Mr. SOURWINE. One personal history statement was the one you put down 40 or more?

Mr. MATUSOW. Forty on that—I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you put down that number the first time you filled out such a statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have a recollection at this point, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You put it down on some subsequent statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. Either first or second, I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Air Force should produce officers to testify you only filled out two such statements, would you admit that to be the truth?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; because the Air Force officials will prove that point wrong. Every time an airman, when he is transferred to a new unit, he, by regulation, must fill out a new personal history statement. That was the Air Force regulation, I believe, dealing with security—no, that would have been—I could check that regulation for you, and

every time you enter a new unit, you fill out one, and I was in more than two units.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then why did you have difficulty in testifying whether you filled out more than two?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, you have been refreshing my recollection, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you now testify whether you filled out more than two such statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. I cannot right now. I think the Air Force would have to come in, and I would have to do some checking.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter of transmittal and a photostat of a statement, a personal history statement filled out by Mr. Matusow, presumably the first one he filled out.

I would like to offer the letter, and I would like to send this photostat down to the witness and ask him if it is a statement which he filled out at Kirtland Air Force, and if the signature on there is his.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I have it back?

Mr. Matusow—

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this for the record as the next exhibit.

Senator JOHNSTON. It may be admitted.

(The documents were numbered 11A and 11B and appear below.)

EXHIBIT NO. 11-A

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,  
Washington, February 25, 1955.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security,  
Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with a request made by Mr. Columbo of your subcommittee staff, attached is a copy of the personal history statement (WD AGO Form 643A) completed at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., on February 13, 1951, by Harvey M. Matusow.

The national agency check was not made on the basis of this personal history statement but on the one executed on March 7, 1951, a copy of which was transmitted to you by letter dated February 21, 1955, and signed by Mr. Frederick Ayer, Jr., special assistant to the Secretary.

As was pointed out in Mr. Ayer's letter of February 21, personal history statements are not, except under extraordinary circumstances, released to congressional committees. In the case of Harvey Matusow the Secretary has consented to the release of these documents to assist the committee in its inquiry into the veracity of this witness.

Sincerely yours,

JOE W. KELLY,  
*Major General, USAF.*  
*Director, Legislative Liaison.*



## 21. DO YOU HAVE A BIRTH CERTIFICATE?

YES  NO  
22. SCARS OR DISTINGUISHING MARKS

None

## 23. WHERE RESIDED

## 24. BIRTH RESIDENCE

Bronx

New York

1918

1918

Bronx

New York

25. SCHOOL ATTENDED	LOCATION	TYPE	DATES OF ATTENDANCE		GRADUATED OR DEGREE CONFERRED
			1	2	
Public School 70	Bronx, New York	Grammar	7	?	
Public School 104	Bronx, New York	Grammar	1936 - 1939	Yes	
Public School 82	Bronx, New York	Grammar	1939 - 1941	Yes	
Wm H. Taft High School	Bronx, New York	High Sch	1941 - 1944	Yes	
Carey College	Bronx, New York	High School	1946 - 1947	No	

None

## 26. WHEREVER UP TO TODAY, HAVE YOU BEEN A MEMBER OF ANY

ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIETIES, CLUBS, AND ASSOCIATIONS, PAST OR PRESENT, IN WHICH YOU HAVE HELD MEMBERSHIP?  
Other than shown in Item 25, I

✓ Communist Party U.S.A.  
✓ American Youth for Democracy  
✓ Peoples Action  
United Office & Prof Workers Union Local 16  
✓ American Newspaper Guild  
✓ Jefferson School  
Young Progressives of America  
American Labor Party, N.Y. State Unity  
✓ Civil Rights Congress

\* Not a member of any of the above at present until the adoption of communism

W.D. 643A

DATE (Year—Mo.)	RESIDENCE FROM BIRTH		CITY	STATE OR COUNTRY
	STREET AND NUMBER	STREET AND NUMBER		
Oct. 3 - 1926	1928	St. Eden & Townsend Ave	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
1928	1931	1504 Morris Ave	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
1931	1935	1566 Macombs Road	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
1935	1943	1563 Macombs Road	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
1943	1948	1421 Macombs Road	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
1948	1948	56 W. 18th St.	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
May 1948	Sept 1948	1491 Macombs Road	Bronx, N.Y.	New York
Jan. 1950	July 1950	167 W. 60th St.	New York C.	New York
Aug. 1950	Jan. 1950	3202 General Delivery Taos	Taos	New Mexico
EMPLOYMENT (Including part time)				
A. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN EMPLOYED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF A FOREIGN NATION AS A CIVILIAN?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		
IF YES, GIVE NATION OF SERVICE		EMPLOYED BY (Division, dept., or agency)		
DATE (Year—Mo.)	EMPLOYED AS	REASON FOR TERMINATION		
None	None	None		
LOCATION (City and country)		None		
None		None		
B. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN EMPLOYED BY A PRIVATE FIRM OF A FOREIGN NATION?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO. IF YES, GIVE NAME AND LOCATION OF FIRM.		
DATE (Year—Mo.)	EMPLOYED AS	LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT		
None	None	None		
LOCATION FOR TERMINATION				
None				
C. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN EMPLOYED BY A PRIVATE FIRM OF A NATION OTHER THAN ABOVE (In alphabetical order—Including part time)		SOCIAL SECURITY NO.		
DATE (Year—Mo.)	EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and State)	119-20-6248		
Nov 1941 - Mar. 1944	Philip Mendelivitz - 897 Morris Ave Bronx, New York			

EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Clerk in Cigar Store		Ready to go into service
DATE (From-To)		EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and state)
Mar 15 1947 - Sept 15 1947		Grey Adv Agency 166 W. 32nd St. New York City, New York
EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Production Assistant		Not enough pay
DATE (From-To)		EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and state)
Sept 15 1947 - Mar 1948		Huell Wosley Productions 234 744th St. New York City, NY
EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Production Assistant		Not enough work - Election Comm for Wallace
DATE (From-To)		EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and state)
Mar 1948 - Sept 1948		Jefferson Book Shop 575 6th Ave, New York City, New York
EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Cigar Sales		No work after Christmas
DATE (From-To)		EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and state)
Sept 1948 - Dec 1948		Peoples Sonnen 126 W. 21st St. New York City, NY
EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Cigar Sales		Organization folded
DATE (From-To)		EMPLOYED BY (Give name, street and number, city, and state)
Sept 1948 - Dec 1948		Contingent Agent 25 W. 21st St. New York City, NY
EMPLOYED AS		REASON FOR TERMINATION
Cigar Sales		To go to work at Camp United
DATE (From-To)		REASON FOR TERMINATION (For civilians only)
Sept 1948 - Dec 1948		
D. NAME AND LOCATION OF EMPLOYING AGENCY OR WAR DEPARTMENT (For civilians only)		
NAME		
JOB TITLE		
CLASSIFICATION		DOPS POSITION INVOLVING HANDLING CLASSIFIED MATERIAL IF YES, GIVE NAME
35. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN ASKED TO DESIGN TURMOUGHED (other than regular <del>for</del> <del>or leave</del> ) OR PUT ON AN INACTIVE STATUS FOR CAUSE WHILE SERVING IN THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, OR COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OR IN ANY POSITION OF PRIVATE OR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT IF SO, STATE CIRCUMSTANCES		

36. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY FEDERAL CRIMES FOR ANY FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		MONTH AND YEAR EXAMINED IN WHAT CITIES		RATING																																																																																										
37. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY FEDERAL CRIMES FOR ANY FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		MONTH AND YEAR EXAMINED IN WHAT CITIES		RATING																																																																																										
<p><b>MILITARY HISTORY</b></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">DATE OF BIRTH</td> <td rowspan="2">DATE INDICTED (if E. M.)</td> <td rowspan="2">ENLISTED SERIAL NO.</td> <td rowspan="2">DATE OF LAST DISCHARGE AS E. M.</td> <td colspan="4">DISCHARGE</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">WORLD WAR, AIR</td> <td rowspan="2">WORLD WAR, LAND</td> <td rowspan="2">WORLD WAR, SEA</td> <td rowspan="2">DATE RECEIVED AS NO. 1000</td> <td colspan="4">DATE OF FIRST COMMISSIONED</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SOURCE OF COMMISSION</td> <td rowspan="2">COMPONENT (PA, WRC, NO, AUS, FORT, NAV, or Joint Component)</td> <td rowspan="2">DATE ENTERED ACTIVE DUTY WORLD WAR, AIR</td> <td colspan="4">DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">HAVE YOU EVER BEEN COMMISSIONED?</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> YES      <input type="checkbox"/> NO</td> <td colspan="4">DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="8"> <p>38. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY FEDERAL CRIMES FOR A FOREIGN NATION?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">NATION OR SERVICE</td> <td colspan="2">PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)</td> <td colspan="2">ARM OR SERVICE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">1942—1945</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">PURPOSE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table>								DATE OF BIRTH	DATE INDICTED (if E. M.)	ENLISTED SERIAL NO.	DATE OF LAST DISCHARGE AS E. M.	DISCHARGE				<input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE	WORLD WAR, AIR	WORLD WAR, LAND	WORLD WAR, SEA	DATE RECEIVED AS NO. 1000	DATE OF FIRST COMMISSIONED				<input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE	SOURCE OF COMMISSION		COMPONENT (PA, WRC, NO, AUS, FORT, NAV, or Joint Component)	DATE ENTERED ACTIVE DUTY WORLD WAR, AIR	DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE				HAVE YOU EVER BEEN COMMISSIONED?		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE				<p>38. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY FEDERAL CRIMES FOR A FOREIGN NATION?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">NATION OR SERVICE</td> <td colspan="2">PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)</td> <td colspan="2">ARM OR SERVICE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">1942—1945</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">PURPOSE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> </table>								NATION OR SERVICE		PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)		ARM OR SERVICE		SINGAPORE		1942—1945		ARMED FORCES		HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED		COUNTRY		ARMED FORCES		SINGAPORE		SINGAPORE		ARMED FORCES		39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY		COUNTRY		PURPOSE		PAKISTAN		PAKISTAN		OVERSEAS DUTY		COLOMBIA		COLOMBIA		OVERSEAS DUTY	
DATE OF BIRTH	DATE INDICTED (if E. M.)	ENLISTED SERIAL NO.	DATE OF LAST DISCHARGE AS E. M.	DISCHARGE																																																																																												
				<input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE																																																																																									
WORLD WAR, AIR	WORLD WAR, LAND	WORLD WAR, SEA	DATE RECEIVED AS NO. 1000	DATE OF FIRST COMMISSIONED																																																																																												
				<input type="checkbox"/> WO SPECIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/> HONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISHONORABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> DISCHARGE																																																																																									
SOURCE OF COMMISSION		COMPONENT (PA, WRC, NO, AUS, FORT, NAV, or Joint Component)	DATE ENTERED ACTIVE DUTY WORLD WAR, AIR	DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE																																																																																												
HAVE YOU EVER BEEN COMMISSIONED?				<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	DATE OF TERMINAL LEAVE																																																																																											
<p>38. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY FEDERAL CRIMES FOR A FOREIGN NATION?</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">NATION OR SERVICE</td> <td colspan="2">PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)</td> <td colspan="2">ARM OR SERVICE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">1942—1945</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">SINGAPORE</td> <td colspan="2">ARMED FORCES</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY</td> <td colspan="2">COUNTRY</td> <td colspan="2">PURPOSE</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">PAKISTAN</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">COLOMBIA</td> <td colspan="2">OVERSEAS DUTY</td> </tr> </table>								NATION OR SERVICE		PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)		ARM OR SERVICE		SINGAPORE		1942—1945		ARMED FORCES		HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED		COUNTRY		ARMED FORCES		SINGAPORE		SINGAPORE		ARMED FORCES		39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY		COUNTRY		PURPOSE		PAKISTAN		PAKISTAN		OVERSEAS DUTY		COLOMBIA		COLOMBIA		OVERSEAS DUTY																																																
NATION OR SERVICE		PERIOD OF SERVICE (From—To)		ARM OR SERVICE																																																																																												
SINGAPORE		1942—1945		ARMED FORCES																																																																																												
HIGHEST GRADE ATTAINED		COUNTRY		ARMED FORCES																																																																																												
SINGAPORE		SINGAPORE		ARMED FORCES																																																																																												
39. FOREIGN COUNTRIES VISITED OR OVERSEAS DUTY		COUNTRY		PURPOSE																																																																																												
PAKISTAN		PAKISTAN		OVERSEAS DUTY																																																																																												
COLOMBIA		COLOMBIA		OVERSEAS DUTY																																																																																												



MOTHER			
MOTHER'S LAST NAME-FIRST NAME-MIDDLE NAME McELROY	ADDRESS 1492 Moonbeam Road, Bronx, New York	LIVING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DECEASED	IF DECEASED, GIVE DATE Living
DATE OF BIRTH October 15, 1899	PLACE OF BIRTH (Country) Russia	CITIZENSHIP (Country) U. S. A.	
IF YOUR CITIZENSHIP WAS DERIVED FROM MOTHER'S NATURALIZATION, GIVE HER NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE NUMBER, DATE, PLACE, AND COUNTRY OF JURISDICTION NO			
STEPARENT			
STEPARENT'S LAST NAME-FIRST NAME-MIDDLE NAME None	ADDRESS (Street and number, city, State, and country) None	CITIZENSHIP (Country) None	
DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (Country)	PRESENT EMPLOYER	
OCCUPATION			
GUARDIAN			
GUARDIAN'S LAST NAME-FIRST NAME-MIDDLE NAME None	ADDRESS (Street and number, city, State, and country) None	CITIZENSHIP (Country) None	
DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (Country)	PRESENT EMPLOYER	
OCCUPATION			
FATHER-IN-LAW			
FATHER-IN-LAW'S LAST NAME-FIRST NAME-MIDDLE NAME None	ADDRESS None	LIVING <input type="checkbox"/> DECEASED	IF DECEASED, GIVE DATE
DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (Country)	CITIZENSHIP (Country)	

## OCCUPATION

47.

## BROTHERS—SISTERS

SEX	NAME	AGE	FULL ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
M.	Daniel B. Matuzow	21	Killed in action N.W. II	SSN 12121523

## RELATIVES LIVING IN FOREIGN LANDS

SEX	RELATIONSHIP	NAME	AGE	FULL ADDRESS	OCCUPATION
		None			

## RELATIVES IN GOVERNMENT OR MILITARY SERVICE (United States or Foreign)

SEX	RELATIONSHIP	NAME	COUNTRY SERVED	TITLE OF POSITION AND DUTIES
		None		

## MARITAL STATUS

50.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SINGLE	<input type="checkbox"/> MARRIED	<input type="checkbox"/> SEPARATED	<input type="checkbox"/> DIVORCED	<input type="checkbox"/> WIDOWER	<input type="checkbox"/> WIDOW
				<input type="checkbox"/> PLACE OF MARRIAGE (State and county)		

NAME OF SPOUSE (Last or maiden name, first name, middle name)

T. C. 10

 LIVING  
 DECEASED

DATE OF BIRTH

PLACE OF BIRTH

 LIVING  
 DECEASED

ADDRESS PRIOR TO MARRIAGE (Street and number, city, State, and country)

PRESENT OCCUPATION

PRESENT EMPLOYER



55. ARE THERE ANY UNFAVORABLE INCIDENTS IN YOUR LIFE NOT MENTIONED ABOVE WHICH YOU BELIEVE MAY REFLECT UPON YOUR LOYALTY TO THE U. S. GOVERNMENT OR UPON YOUR ABILITY TO PERFORM THE DUTIES WHICH YOU WILL BE CALLED UPON TO UNDERTAKE?  YES  NO. IF SO, DESCRIBE (If additional space is necessary, use Remarks.)

(See Section 32.)

56. NOTIFY IN CASE OF EMERGENCY (Give name, relationship, and address)

NAME: Harvey H. Matusow 1421 Vacombs Road Bronx 52, New York

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING ANSWERS ARE TRUE, CORRECT, AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF AND IN SIGNING THIS CERTIFICATE I DO SO WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE VERACITY OF ALL STATEMENTS MADE HEREIN WILL BE INVESTIGATED AND IF FOUND INCORRECT, INCOMPLETE, OR MISLEADING IN ANY PARTICULAR I MAY BE RELIEVED OF MY ASSIGNMENT AND SUCH OTHER DISCIPLINARY ACTION TAKEN AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE.

13-11-1032-5951  
(MAN)

(SIGNATURE)

*Harvey H. Matusow*

*Harvey H. Matusow  
Secretary to Chairman  
Communist Party USA*

Harvey H. Matusow  
Secretary  
CPUSA  
USA

(WITNESS)



Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, I would like to ask with regard to the organizations which you listed here under item 32.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I respectfully submit to the committee, I know of at this time two additional personal history statements that were filled out at the Air Force. There were at least two other personal statements, I believe Form 346-A, if my memory is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you just looked at one and you didn't remember accurately. It is 643.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was a 6-page form in red, and the Air Force supplemented it with a 4-page white form sometime in 1951, and the other 2 statements were on the supplemental form or the one that superseded this 643-A.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that conclude your testimony you are volunteering about statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; so that it might be straight, and so that the committee might try to locate them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, on this question No. 32, which says, list of organizations and associations, past or present, in which you have been a member, you list 13 organizations.

Mr. MATUSOW. On that form; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, I would like to ask about this. This form appears to be dated—

Mr. MATUSOW. February 13, 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. February 13, 1951.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, were you, on February 13, 1951, a member of the Communist Party, U. S. A.?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you at that time a member of the American League for Democracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you at that time a member of the Labor Union League?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume—I had been expelled by that time, but I never received an official notice. I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the Jefferson School?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, student, or associated with them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you a member of the Young Progressives of America?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the American Labor Party, New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Peoples Forum?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Peoples Artists?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the United Office and Professional Workers Union Local 16?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the American Newspaper Guild?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I believe I was a member at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of the Progressive Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of Camp Unity?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you prior to that time been a member of all those?

Mr. MATUSOW. A member of or associated with all those; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the information that you gave on this form at this time was not untrue under question 32; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, the answers I gave that I had been a member, was true, or had been associated with.

Mr. SOURWINE. There were no answers on this form which had been put down as "cute?"

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I thought at the time it was cute, putting them down as such; but not in your context, they were facts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you will remember our discussion earlier of the affidavit you gave the New York Times?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were requested to furnish the names of the six Communists you knew on the New York Times staff?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you furnish us those names now?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been unable to get any recollection of it. I have no way of getting them, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is your response, you will not be able to furnish the committee with those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. When and if those names come to mind, the committee will have them; but at this point they are not—I tried thinking about them—and I don't want to invent names, as I have done in the past.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any record of those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever make any written records of those names?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have, I think—the reports I gave the FBI might have that, but I have not seen those reports and therefore don't have them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you ever read the pamphlet Communist on the Waterfront, written by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection reading it. I have seen it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever read the pamphlet called Inside Job by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have seen it. I don't believe I read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever own either of these pamphlets?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever write your name in any of those pamphlets?

Mr. MATUSOW. Quite possible, if I own them.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you owned Communist literature, did you read much of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read some of it and some I did not read.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stamp them for your library and put your name on books you did not read?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you know that the book Inside Job by Herb Tank, published in pamphlet form and having the subtitle The Story of a Labor Movement, containing the following statement on page 37—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I read it. I don't know any statements contained therein.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say you didn't read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is I didn't read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I send to you a copy of Inside Job which bears on the front the stamp "Library of Harvey M. Matusow," and on the inside cover in the upper right-hand corner the word "Mat" written in ink, and ask you if that was a book at one time in your library, and if you wrote the "Mat" in the upper right-hand corner on that page.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. This book—that is my handwriting, and the book was apparently at one time in my library.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now that you have that book in your hand, does that refresh your recollection whether you read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I have about 1,000 magazines and pamphlets in my library, and I don't believe I ever read this.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that, however, a part of your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. A part of my collection of Communist literature.

Mr. SOURWINE. Doesn't that say "by Herb Tank?" Didn't you know it was a book by Herb Tank when you had it in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. Apparently so.

Mr. SOURWINE. And if you did not know Herb Tank was a Communist, how in the world did you classify this as "Communist literature" in your collection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, the book was published by New Century Publishers—

Mr. SOURWINE. Where do you find that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Page 2.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you have read page 2?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, if you want to split hairs, we can go on for days splitting hairs and we can be sitting here from now on until doomsday.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you were the one who testified before that you were here to split each hair, to find out the facts and—

Mr. MATUSOW. I will split hairs as long as you want to.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want an answer—

Mr. MATUSOW. And I say I haven't read that pamphlet and that is my answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, there is no need to raise your voice.

Mr. MATUSOW. You want to investigate a conspiracy of false witnesses or do you want to investigate somebody reading a pamphlet—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, at the moment the committee is interested in you and the veracity of your statements, if any. I want to know if it is now your testimony that you did, when you had that book in the library, read that, the flyleaf—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't consider reading a flyleaf as reading a book—

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying that you read the flyleaf?

Mr. MATUSOW. Apparently I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. More than "apparently." I want you to testify if you did.

Mr. MATUSOW. I say apparently I did. That is my answer for the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether you did or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. If I gave you a definite "yes" or "no" answer I would be lying. I say apparently I did, and that is my best recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, you don't have to lie to say "I don't know if I did or not," or "I do know."

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think "apparently I did" covers the answer, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. No, it does not.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, it does for me, sir. I don't know how to answer you in any other way.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want you to try to answer—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't want you to put words in my mouth, and I want you—

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, the witness is argumentative. I think he should cool down a little bit.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are an intelligent man, Mr. Matusow, and I think you realize when I pointed out to you that when you say "apparently I did," you are only talking about the effects of testimony, a fact that has already been disclosed.

The question of whether you now know whether you did is a matter which concerns a knowledge in your own mind concerning which no one else can testify. It is not "apparently" that you now know you did. I am asking, do you know or don't you know now that you had read at least as far as the first page of that book.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I read the flyleaf of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir. May I have the book back, please. You did testify you have read the cover—or would you not, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I did read the cover.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you had no question this was a book by Herb Tank?

Mr. MATUSOW. The name "Herb Tank" is on that cover.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did you know it was put out by a Communist publisher?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that day I believed New Century Publishers to be a Communist publishing house and on the basis of my anti-Communist experience, I said so, that was my belief.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you changed that belief since then?

Mr. MATUSOW. It may be Communist, it might not, I have no direct knowledge of it being so, nothing that I know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this marked as the next numbered exhibit, that book.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be marked as the next exhibit.

(The document was numbered "Exhibit No. 12" and placed in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in the present state of the record, Mr. Matusow, do you still want to testify you have no opinion as to whether Herb Tank is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, I have no opinion; I don't care one way or the other.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in your book, sir, you told about—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You say you don't care whether he is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, previously I said I am against communism—the sin, not the sinner, and I base my relationships with people—

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you were against the theory but not the people who belonged to it: is that it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I don't ask people their political opinion. I associate with people regardless of who they are if I find them interesting and friendly, just as you as a Democrat associate with Republicans and the Republicans talk to you, and you don't ask about policies, and I make relationships with people on that same basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You think communism is just a political question, just another political party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said all the Communists or most of the Communists I knew as Communists were intellectual Communists and were not capable of violence; and I also stated for the record the fact that if you think I am not against any "ism" and wouldn't defend the United States against any attack—

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have said in your book that you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism—

Mr. MATUSOW. And other subjects.

Mr. SOURWINE. About how many thousand books and pamphlets were in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. In my library are included much literature on folklore, music, arts—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. When you say "Communist literature," I never broke it down, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have had a collection of Communist literature, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am only concerned with that collection. I want to know how many thousand volumes.

Mr. MATUSOW. There aren't a thousand volumes in that collection, a few hundred pamphlets, a few hundred—100 books, maybe.

Mr. SOURWINE. So this library—

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I sold them at \$600 or \$700 at one point.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not in your book *False Witness* say you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you want to tell us now that the few thousand you referred to in your book was in fact only a few hundred, maybe 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. It may have been a few thousand magazines, pamphlets, books—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, have you not a moment ago denied that and said only a few hundred, maybe 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said to the best of my recollection and if I didn't, it should have been said. The answer could be gotten very easily by contacting the proprietor of Strand Book Shop on Fourth Avenue, who purchased complete libraries and made lists—

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, he didn't write False Witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. He did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You wrote that book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you testified to us that what you said in that book about accumulating a few thousand—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, all right, sir. I am not going to argue that point, it is not important.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is not important whether you told lies in this book False Witness, that is extremely germane.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to know if it is true as stated in this book you had accumulated a few thousand books and pamphlets on Marxism.

Mr. MATUSOW. If I stated it, it is true.

Mr. SOURWINE. If you stated it, it is true?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that true of everything else you ever stated?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have come here to tell the committee I told falsehoods in the past so apparently it is not true.

Mr. SOURWINE. You realize that you have already testified here that everything in that book is true?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did that, sir, outside of typographical errors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, if the Strand Book Shop says that there were fewer than 200 books in the collection that you sold—

Mr. MATUSOW. Books and pamphlets?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Would you admit that the book was wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would admit the Strand Book Shop proprietor is wrong.

Mr. SOURWINE. If the Strand Book Shop proprietor should testify there were fewer than 1,000 in that collection, would you admit that the book was wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. I would have to see his list.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, now, a moment ago you said you did not have an independent recollection and you referred it to the Strand Book Shop for us to find out how many there were in your collection; didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, let us find out, and get to the point. This is kind of ridiculous—

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. Answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to hear the question again.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think the question has been answered.

Did you read, Mr. Matusow, the majority of those books?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir. I have read parts of the majority of the books, I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. You read parts of a majority of the books in your recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say then that it was a fair statement you had read parts of more than 100 books on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I don't know if it would be or wouldn't. I haven't got any recollection at this point. A lot of my reading of that period was on American folklore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have a collection of books on American folklore?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. How many books did you have in that collection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I had between 7 or 8 songbooks; I had 3 books by Crown—a history of American folklore, and I believe they just put 1 out for the South; and I had a book on John Henry—I had a number of books on John Henry—and Caxton—

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, Mr. Matusow, it sounds like more when you catalog them, but the question is, How many?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am trying to think how many. I would say maybe 35 to 50.

Mr. SOURWINE. As compared with hundreds or thousands in your collection of Communist literature?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not say—also, I had novels, classics, books on art—

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were talking about folklore, did you testify you had 35 or—

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have 100.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, did you have 100?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Turning to another subject, Mr. Matusow—

Senator WELKER. If I may interrupt before counsel proceeds further, I would like to go back to this Air Force matter a little bit.

I direct your attention to page 40 of your so-called book, *False Witness*.

Mr. MATUSOW. Do you mind if I refer to it at the same time?

Senator WELKER. O. K., go ahead.

At the top of page 40, Mr. Matusow, line 6, you are relating that when you received a subpoena to appear before a congressional committee you acted—

Like a little boy running home with an A on his report card crying, "Mommy, mommy, see what I got." And everybody saw what I had. It was a bona fide subpoena which entitled me to thumb my nose at the Air Force investigators. I had the power of Congress behind me.

And in the second paragraph you say:

The lack of trust the Air Force had shown me was the straw that broke the camel's back in justifying my role as a witness.

And then you say on that same page:

The Air Force had forced me, with my back to the wall, to a point where I was ready to crucify anyone publicly in order to get myself away from that bleak wall of insecurity.

Now, Mr. Matusow, going over to page 46, the next to the last paragraph of your so-called book, *False Witness*, you say:

For up until this point I was still able to lie and bluff the public when I was accused of being a stool pigeon—a word which I hated violently.

Do you recall writing that?

MR. MATUSOW. Taking it out of context as you are doing it, sir, I wrote those lines but not those thoughts in their entirety; you are leaving a false impression.

SENATOR WELKER. Is the committee to understand that you did hate the word "stool pigeon" violently?

MR. MATUSOW. I hated it violently.

SENATOR WELKER. But notwithstanding that fact, you accepted when you were asked as a witness and went out crucifying people; is that correct?

MR. MATUSOW. I joined in with congressional committees and crucified people; yes, sir.

SENATOR WELKER. And then, directing your attention again—and we will not take it out of context any more—to paragraph No. 2 on page number 47 of your book, I quote:

It was also important that I be in the headlines so I could refute the accusations that I was still a Communist and throw back into the faces of my Air Force accusers their distrust of me. I wanted to be able to say, "Yeah, you call me a Communist, but how many Communists have you put in jail?"

Now, did you so write that?

MR. MATUSOW. Yes, I did, sir.

SENATOR WELKER. Then in the next paragraph you say:

\* \* \* I looked forward to the day I could say to my accusers, "I helped convict seventeen Communists."

I made up my mind then and there to continue the role of witness.

And then the last words in that paragraph:

Now I had the "badge of honor,"—a veteran of two wars.

Notwithstanding the fact that at the time you wrote this book that you said you had hated violently the word "stool pigeon"—

MR. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

SENATOR WELKER. Well, then, how do you account for the fact that after writing those words you volunteered to go out and be a stool pigeon and now you say a lying stool pigeon—

MR. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

SENATOR WELKER. How do you account for the fact you did the things—

MR. MATUSOW. Because these committees, such as this one, of Congress, forced me and many others to do it.

SENATOR WELKER. We forced you?

MR. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, by creating a fear, a hysteria in this country which this country has never seen before. The people cannot turn around and talk to neighbors without fear of being called Communists, honest, decent people—you are the one responsible for my role as a witness, not I.

SENATOR WELKER. Have you ever heard the Senator you are addressing your intemperate remarks to, accusing anyone of being a Communist without ever having the full facts before him—have you?

MR. MATUSOW. My knowledge of you, sir, and the record of this committee, not to be personal of any Senator—

SENATOR WELKER. I am asking about the interrogator—and I am proud of this committee.

MR. MATUSOW. This committee could do a better job if it went to facts.

Senator WELKER. Yes, we can, and when we do experience having a lying witness, Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. I can give a list of a number of Matusows.

Senator WELKER. Yes, but we are talking about one Harvey Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. A former liar.

Senator WELKER. An admitted liar of every degree and extent.

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you afraid of the truth, sir?

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you afraid of the truth?

Senator WELKER. Tell me one person I have ever called a Communist, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am talking about the witnesses before your committee—

Senator WELKER. I am not afraid of any truth you can give because I don't think there is any truth in your body.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Daniel.

Senator DANIEL. I am just a new member on this committee. I would like to know what member on this committee ever forced you to give any kind of false testimony to this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Statements made in the public press creating hysteria is what I was referring to.

Senator DANIEL. Will you please answer?

The CHAIRMAN. Answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. There is no member of the committee personally that made me give false testimony. That was not my remark.

Senator DANIEL. Do I understand your answer, no member of the committee forced you to give false testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, but the creation of the committee and activities of the committee would—

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you are not leaving the impression that anyone on this committee either asked you or forced you to give this false testimony to this committee or any other committee of Congress?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I think that should be cleared up.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Because a wrong impression could be gained from what you previously said about that matter.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I agree with you.

Senator DANIEL. Would you like to have your previous remarks concerning forced testimony before the committee stricken from the record?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was forced by public pressure, by the reports of this committee circulated throughout the country, giving people immunity, in which people could attack other people based on lies I told the committee, that is the danger.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am referring to the remark that you just made, a wrong impression could be gained from it about being forced—

Mr. MATUSOW. No member forced me to testify falsely or otherwise.

Senator DANIEL. And you would like that remarks stricken from the record, I suppose?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I would appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember having a talk with the ticket agent at Albuquerque?

Mr. MATUSOW. A very vague recollection of such conversation.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember telling him you were going to Taos because somebody there wanted you to write a book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall that; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you say, "If they are crazy enough to pay me, I will write anything"?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I don't recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you say anything to him that sounded like that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. I doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. If you said that, you would remember it, would you not, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, sir, I doubt if I said it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer my question? If you said that, would you remember saying that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably, but I don't know, sir—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, did you talk to the ticket agent at Albuquerque?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I had to get a ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. You talked to him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you talk about?

Mr. MATUSOW. Told him I wanted a ticket.

The CHAIRMAN. What else did you tell him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. Might have talked about the weather.

The CHAIRMAN. But did not talk about the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I referred—one specific part of the conversation was a reference to a story that appeared in the Albuquerque Journal in which there was a quote saying—

Leave the dirty game of politics to little men with little minds—

and that was on the front page of the Albuquerque paper.

The CHAIRMAN. If you referred to that, what did he say?

Mr. MATUSOW. I referred to the quote.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the ticket agent say?

Mr. MATUSOW. He laughed.

The CHAIRMAN. That was, he did not comment, he laughed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall what he said.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that was in substance all you talked about, just what you recounted?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is all I recall talking about; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you did not state to him that remark about writing—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall any such remark and I doubt it very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, will you state definitely whether you made the statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I doubt very much. I would not categorically admit any statement—

The CHAIRMAN. Answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. I couldn't say definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. I see how you stutter around the perjury, but you are very smart, but be frank with the committee—

Mr. MATUSOW. I say, I don't recall.

The CHAIRMAN. You remember conferring with him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had to get a ticket from him.

The CHAIRMAN. On a number of things, in conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, wouldn't it be the time to make the statement that Mr. Sourwine asked you about?

Mr. MATUSOW. I doubt very much if I made it, and if I did I don't remember it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is still not answering.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know how else—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you make the statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall making the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you testify you did not make such?

Mr. MATUSOW. I testify I don't recall making the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question. Will you testify you did not make such statement?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only answer is, I don't recall making that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been pretty well coached.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been coached only by conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been—

Mr. MATUSOW. You made that statement on television yesterday and you are making it again, and you are wrong.

(Witness consults with counsel.)

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow is conferring with counsel. I wanted to give him an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Matusow, are you aware of the use the Communist Party, through its organizations, its fronts, and its publications, is making of the occasion of your self-accusation?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am aware that members of the Communist Party are pleased, to say the least, about my affidavit in the trial of the 13 Communist leaders and the other admissions I have made.

Mr. SOURWINE. That comes close to answering the question, but the question is whether you know how the Communist Party, through its press and its organizations and the members is using the occasion of your self-accusation.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not a Communist. I have no knowledge of how the Communists are taking this.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you read the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know the Daily Worker of February 24 carried an editorial, Labor Spy Racket, capitalizing upon your statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have seen it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer this for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Mark that as an exhibit.

(The clipping was marked "Exhibit No. 13" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 13

LABOR SPY RACKET

Another day of testimony by Harvey Matusow disclosed that Senator McCarthy himself sent Matusow into Montana and Washington to campaign for the Republican candidates there by pinning the red tag on Senators Mansfield and Jackson, the Democrats endorsed by unions.

As Americans, especially unionists, read the daily disclosures of Harvey Matusow, it becomes evident to them that they have been the victims of the greatest hoax since Hitler used the big lie technique to throw the German people into a disastrous slaughter.

Along with the doings revealed now by Matusow, the informer system has been developed behind the scenes as part of an anti-labor espionage system—a sort of industrial McCarthyism. This has been built to a level that makes the privately operated spy corporations, exposed by the LaFollette committee a generation back, look like small potatoes.

Just as the former agencies grew to become a major roadblock to labor organization in the major industries, so today the new Government-inspired industrial espionage has become a menace that the labor movement can no longer ignore. A growing number of unions whose leaders have been notoriously anti-Communist are now forced to wage a struggle in defense of victims of "loyalty" screening in their own camp.

What began as a program to screen Federal Government employees has now spread to millions in State and municipal employ and to even more millions in industries that have Government contracts or desire to qualify for such contracts.

The people should be aroused to action now, not when spy agencies have a stranglehold on every industrial community in the country. The demand for a real LaFollette-type investigation of the entire informer system and of the role of the Justice Department should be raised everywhere and taken to the Senate Judiciary Committee and its chairman, Senator Harley Kilgore.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know the Daily Worker on the 22d of February carried a story with the headline "Senator Eastland Fails to Shake Matusow Story," in which the lead reads as follows:

Senator James O. Eastland's Internal Security Committee task force today was blocked by a solid wall of candor in its effort to rescue from infamy the witch-hunters' stable of stool pigeons.

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall reading that story.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I offer that for the record?

The CHAIRMAN. That will be received.

(The article was numbered "Exhibit No. 14" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 14

SENATOR EASTLAND FAILS TO SHAKE MATUSOW STORY

(By Abner W. Berry)

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 21.—Senator James O. Eastland's Internal Security Committee task force today was blocked by a solid wall of candor in its effort to rescue from infamy the witch-hunters' stable of stool pigeons. The Mississippi Democrat and his aids were able to draw from Witness Harvey Matusow, the 28-year-old former informer who has now recanted his lying testimony, that he was sick of being a tool of Republican front organizations. Matusow, who showed more poise than his interrogators, time after time aroused the crowded hearing room to laughter when the committee members and counsel fell into pits they had prepared for the witness. This was the case when Eastland insisted upon pressing from the witness just who had paid him for attacking people. Matusow answered that he had been paid about \$70 for attacking Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, in the 1952 election campaign, and that he had received "twelve or fourteen hundred dollars" for making accusations against Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, during the same campaign.

"I was paid to make those speeches," Matusow declared.

When Eastland insisted upon knowing who had paid the witness, Matusow said he couldn't recall who had paid him in Washington, but he did recall that in Montana he was paid by J. H. Morrow—spelling out the name "Morrow"—who represented a Montana group, For America, described by the witness as "a Republican front organization." The guffaws that had to be rapped down by the chairman's gavel were not at the witness' expense.

At the opening of the hearings Senator Eastland made it clear that it was his purpose to clear from any stigma from recent recantations all those informers whose testimony has been used to smear or convict.

In a 4-page written harangue, Eastland extolled the work of Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers and outdid the courts on the pumpkin papers, stating that some of the documents in Whittaker Chambers' pumpkin contained the handwriting of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White. Followers of both cases were led to believe that the documents in the pumpkin were handwritten. Eastland also tried Owen Lattimore and the Institute of Pacific Relations in his harangue, finding both guilty of being part of the "world Communist conspiracy" which can only be prosecuted with the aid of ex-Communists.

Eastland also rehashed again by citing legal authorities that "conspiracies need not be established by direct evidence of the act charged." The Mississippian described what he called the unbridled fury of the assault on the ex-Communist who is willing to tell what he knows.

Matusow's testimony on this last point punctured Eastland's theory entirely. He said in answers to questions as to how he got in contact with Cameron & Kahn, the publishers of his forthcoming book, *False Witness*, that it was done through a phone call to Matusow in Dallas. That was last October. Later, Matusow said, he approached the publishers by phone, finally leading to contracts for publication.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Do you know that the *Daily Worker* on the 27th of February carried an editorial, *Let's Have the Full Story*, which began as follows:

As the Government and witch-hunting con men jump in with frantic efforts to suppress the confession of the repentant informer, Harvey Matusow, new disclosures leak out?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** Yes, sir. There are other editorials. The *New York Times*, the *Herald Tribune*.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** I offer this for the record.

**The CHAIRMAN.** That will be received.

(The editorial was marked "Exhibit 15" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT NO. 15

##### LET'S HAVE THE FULL STORY

As the Government and the witch-hunting con men jump in with frantic efforts to suppress the confessions of the repentant informer, Harvey Matusow, new disclosures leak out. And they indicate that only a small fraction of the whole story has been told of the thought-control drive of these past several years, with its security programs, screening out of militant trade unionists, McCarthyite investigations, Smith Act arrests, and other political frameups.

They indicate that the time is long overdue for a real public investigation of the type conducted by the late Senator La Follette during the thirties, which exposed the whole ugly labor spy racket of those days.

But even the labor spy racket, which was rocked to its heels by the La Follette probe, has taken a new lease on life and grown into a business with a \$250 million annual take. The subversive-hunting drive whose main instrument is the lying informer, has spilled over into industry, with even the Defense Department admitting that 4,000 security risks have been fired from industry.

As was inevitable, the drive against communism has become translated in industry into a drive against militant union men and women. The last CIO convention expressed alarm over this situation. The CIO United Auto Workers has taken on the case of John Lupa, screened out of an arsenal plant as a security risk. Other unions have begun to speak out. Senator Humphrey,

Democrat, of Minnesota, has scheduled a hearing March 3 on a resolution to establish bipartisan commission to investigate the security program.

There is one flaw, however, in these steps. So far they are still predicated on the proposition that it's O. K. to move against Communists, but that the only thing at issue is the method. This, it is indicated, will be the scope of the Humphrey committee hearing.

But increasingly large numbers of Americans, and especially trade unionists, have begun to learn that a political witch hunt aimed at one group of Americans inevitably threatens the rights of all Americans. The big lie about the menace of communism is what has given rise to the McCarthys, the lying informers, the resurgence of the labor spy racket, the blacklisting of workers. It is time for Americans, and for labor in the first instance, to speak out for an end to this nightmare of witch hunting.

A good first step would be a new La Follette type of investigation into the whole racket of the lying, professional informers. Such an investigation cannot be entrusted to a Senator Humphrey who was denounced even by his own supporters for his hysterical role in jamming through the Communist Control Act in the last Congress, an act which gave a new lease to the informers and the witch hunters. Such an investigation should be conducted by a body such as the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Harley Kilgore, veteran pro-labor Senator of West Virginia.

At the same time every case in which these professional informers have been used—the 13 Communist leaders, Clinton Jencks, and others—should be reopened. This is the least that needs to be done if our Bill of Rights is to be rescued from the Brownells and the McCarthys.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. You are trying to leave an impression here, sir, of something that doesn't exist.

The CHAIRMAN. You answer the questions that are asked you. Make your answers responsive to the questions.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. We were concerned with the basic question of your knowledge of how the Communists are using you, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I have no knowledge of how the Communists are attempting to or would be—

Mr. SOURWINE. Having said that, we are now establishing that you did know of some of these things.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have read the Daily Worker and I have read the New York Times. I also read the Congressional Record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Sunday Worker of February 27 had carried a story, the caption of which is: "Others Also Lied, Matusow Tells Snarling Senators."

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I believe I read the story.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 16" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 16

##### OTHERS ALSO LIED, MATUSOW TELLS SNARLING SENATORS

(By Abner W. Berry)

WASHINGTON.—In an atmosphere of sterner political morality the klieglighted drama which transpired in room 318 of the Senate Office Building would have set the Government to rocking. Here sat in the witness chair a confident, well-dressed young man who had wrestled with his conscience over lies he had told under oath, lies which had caused some of his victims to be imprisoned and others to become targets for political assassins.

His self-confessed skulduggery, he testified, had been aided by officials of the Department of Justice and Members of the United States Senate. He was treated by the august members of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security,

not as a welcome prodigal back to the realm of truth, but as a national traitor. How dare this Harvey Matusow place his own conscience above the historical blueprint drawn up by his questioners.

But Harvey Matusow, said he had wrestled with the angels of his conscience and he stood toe to toe with the committee members who only a few short months ago would have hailed him as a national hero. There was no hesitation in his answers, even when the questions seemed to place him in a bad light.

By contrast, there was desperation on all levels displayed by those who questioned him. Committee Counsel Jay G. Sourwine set out to establish what he called Matusow's confused state of mind by asking him whether certain passages from Matusow's forthcoming book, *False Witness*, represented the truth. Was Matusow motivated in giving his false testimony, as the book had it, because of fear, greed, and need?

Without a pause, Matusow answered "Yes," and went on to explain that he was afraid of being arrested and wanted to clear himself from the taint of communism.

Senator James O. Eastland, the Mississippi Democrat, began sniffing something here and wanted to know who Matusow had unjustly attacked for money. The unhesitating answer was Senator (Mike) Mansfield (Democrat, Montana) and Senator Henry M. Jackson (Democrat, Washington). Matusow said he had made radio speeches against both Senators during the 1952 election campaign, accusing them of Communist connections. Under further questioning by Eastland, Matusow remembered that he had received about \$700 for attacking Jackson and twelve or fourteen hundred dollars for speaking against Mansfield.

These answers didn't satisfy Eastland; he barked further questions like a hound sniffing the first scent of game; he wanted to know "who paid you?" Matusow couldn't remember who had paid him for attacking Jackson but he recalled that a J. H. Morrow had paid him for his Montana speeches against Mansfield. Morrow, he said, acted for a group called Montana Citizens for America—a Republican-front organization.

Eastland had made it clear in his opening statement as chairman of the subcommittee hearing that his objective was to defend the stool pigeons whose consciences were still untroubled. As the representatives of true Americanism, opposed to that of the present witness, Eastland read some lengthy praises of Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that the Daily Worker of the 27th of February carried a feature story by Marion Bachrach:

"Is This the Twilight of the Informer"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never saw that story, but it is probably so. I didn't read it in the Daily Worker.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Marion Bachrach is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew her as a Communist.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 17" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT NO. 17

##### IS THIS THE TWILIGHT OF THE INFORMER?

(By Marion Bachrach)

The news of February 15 was much like that on any other day in these strange times: full of good and bad, the one seeming to cancel out the other.

That was the day Senator Margaret Chase Smith (Republican, of Maine) told a Philadelphia audience the end was in sight for the era of the professional demagogues who question the Americanism of anyone who may disagree with them. And she added:

"At long last, the shining truth about the false accusers, the half-truth artists, the professional fabricators, the prevaricators for pay—is beginning to break through the dark and ugly clouds of doubt they have so evilly blown up."

On that day, Harvey Matusow, one of the false accusers, was admitting the

shining truth in the same Foley Square Courthouse where he—and scores of other prevaricators for pay had lied to send innocent men and women to prison, destroy hundreds of reputations, and add thousands of names to the list of those barred from Government or private employment.

It did seem that the dark and ugly clouds smothering America under a smog of intimidation were lifting. And yet—

On that same February 15, in a Chicago courtroom, Claude Lightfoot was sentenced to 5 years in prison—solely on the word of a few professional fabricators, who professed to know what goes on in his head.

On February 15, the rift in the cloud of lies noted by Senator Smith was not yet big enough to let the shining truth open the prison doors, behind which Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Pettis Perry, and their comrades had been placed by the perjured testimony of Harvey Matusow, and others from Roy Cohn's stable of half-truth artists.

Not big enough to free Owen Lattimore from his long ordeal by slander, or to break down the blank wall cutting Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer off from his scientific coworkers—or to clear, once and for all, Dr. Edward U. Condon—or to restore the jobs of thousand of blacklisted workers, teachers, writers, actors, Government employees.

The shining truth about the false accusers was 3½ slow years in catching up with the frameup that sent Eugene Dennis and his comrades of the Communist Party national committee to prison.

Will the shining truth, at long last, overtake the new lies in the making—and save these Communist leaders from the double jeopardy of being tried and convicted again by the lies of the same or new prevaricators for pay?

Is Senator Smith right—is the end of the reign of false accusers really in sight?

Pondering these questions in February 1955, some of us with long memories thought back to February 1927 \* \* \* to the first "preliminary" report of the LaFollette committee, established by the Senate to look into the dirty business of labor espionage and related matters.

That report revealed what subsequent reports, based on years of investigation, would later spell out in great detail, that literally millions of us were caught in a vast espionage net, of whose workings we had only "fragmentary" knowledge. In that February of so long ago the Senate Civil Liberties Committee found that American workers "have learned about spying too late by running afoul of it; they experience its effects without knowing what has happened to them."

Of course, back in those days the labor espionage system was mostly "free private enterprise"—run by the private detective agencies, the big corporations, and the employer associations. Now it has become predominantly a Government enterprise which fosters a host of private auxiliaries.

But our knowledge of how this new and vaster spy system works remains fragmentary. Most of us have "learned about spying too late by running afoul of it." Much of what we learned about the workings of labor espionage in the 1930's has been forgotten, even by the trade unions, and must be learned all over again.

Thanks to the Matusow revelations, we are beginning to relearn the fact once solidly established by the LaFollette committee:

"When the spy is unable to find any information to send in with his report, he can always turn to his imagination."

Harvey Matusow is not the first informer to confess himself an habitual liar. Once it was C. M. "Red" Knhl who made headlines when he told the LaFollette committee:

"If the client does not seem to think he is receiving enough information, why you go out and get hold of these 'ops' and tell them flat turkey, 'It's your job, too, so maybe you better use your imagination a little and write something \* \* \* of interest to the client.'"

But to relearn that a spy is a spy is a spy \* \* \* no matter against whom he lies \* \* \* is less than enough.

The Providence Journal hit the nail on the head when it called editorially for reexamination of the whole "security" program—from "premise to personnel."

Back in the 1930's we discovered that the espionage system of that day was based on the premise that labor spying could kill the idea of trade-union organization which had seized the minds of millions of workers. We didn't get far in our effort to free ourselves from snoopers until we exposed what the LaFollette committee called, in a chapter of one of its reports, "The pretense that espionage activities are directed against communism."

There came a time in the 1930's when the Senate of the United States unanimously passed a resolution declaring:

"That the so-called industrial spy system breeds fear, suspicion, and animosity, tends to cause strikes and industrial warfare, and is contrary to sound public policy."

But that didn't happen until millions of workers, tearing away the pretense that employers needed espionage to "protect the country from communism," had come to grips with the premise on which the whole *evil* spy system was based—and built a powerful new trade-union movement.

Was Senator Smith right? Can we really see the end of this sinister "cult of the informer," this era of demagogues who brook no dissent?

The answer depends on all of us, and in the first place on today's powerful labor movement—which owes its very existence to the fact that it once compelled the United States Senate to expose the why as well as the how of labor espionage.

We will surely find many ways to help our fellow Americans speed the day when the shining truth will triumph over all the lies bought and paid for by the Eisenhower administration and the bipartisan witch hunters.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that the Daily Worker of the 25th of February carried a story called A Smith Act Prosecutor Forgets?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the story.

Mr. SOURWINE. I offer that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 18" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT No. 18

##### A SMITH ACT PROSECUTOR FORGETS

(By Harry Raymond)

David L. Marks, who as special assistant to the United States Attorney General was in charge of prosecution of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and her 12 co-defendants in the 1952 trial, yesterday pleaded a lack of memory when questioned by Harry Sacher, attorney for the 13, about pretrial conferences with Harvey Matusow while preparing Matusow's self-confessed false testimony for the Smith Act case.

"I'm not sure," "I don't recall," "I don't remember," were the Marks answers when Sacher asked him to give the substance of secret talks he and his assistants, Roy Cohn, Albert Blinder, Robert Reagan, John Foley, and James Ryan, had with Matusow.

Marks was the first Government witness called by the United States Prosecutor J. Edward Lumbard in the hearing before Judge Edward J. Dimock on a motion for a new trial for the 13.

Sacher quizzed Marks about Matusow's statement that Cohn coached him to fabricate testimony about a conversation he said he had with defendant Alexander Trachtenberg concerning the late Andrei Vishinsky's book, *Law and the Soviet State*.

Marks said he recalled meeting Matusow secretly in a parked car on the lower East River Drive in December 1951. With him in the car, he said, were FBI Agent J. J. McCarthy, Cohn, Blinder, and Foley. He said Matusow was introduced to him by the agent under the fictitious name John Alden.

Cohn, he added, sat in the front seat with Matusow and was "doing most of the questioning." This coincided with part of Matusow's testimony at the outset of the hearing. Marks said he had difficulty recalling the conversation. He said he did not remember any discussion about Trachtenberg and the Vishinsky book at the East River rendezvous.

"I just can't remember what Mr. Cohn said," Marks told the court, "I can't specifically remember, but it is entirely likely Cohn told Matusow the defendants were indicted for teaching the 'advocacy of violent overthrow of the Government'."

Marks told of two long conferences he, Cohn, Reagan, Blinder, and McCarthy had in Lumbard's office in which the Matusow recantations were discussed, and three or four earlier meetings with Lumbard.

Sacher's examination brought the reluctant production by Lumbard of three versions of so-called witness sheets worked up by Cohn and Reagan and used, Matusow had testified, to memorize what he was to say.

Also placed in evidence was a confidential office memo signed by Marks to former United States Attorney Myles Lane, stating he agreed with Cohn that Matusow should be a witness.

The hearing continues today in the Federal courthouse with Cohn and others subpoenaed by the Government as witnesses.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Daily People's World of Friday, February 11, carried a story: Notables Back Anti-Informer Petition Drive?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I don't see the People's World, the paper you are referring to.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** I offer that for the record.

**The CHAIRMAN.** That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 19" and appears below:)

#### EXHIBIT NO. 19

#### NOTABLES BACK ANTI-INFORMER PETITION DRIVE

LOS ANGELES, February 10.—A petition calling on Attorney General Herbert Brownell to end the use of paid informers and to reexamine all convictions obtained with their help was being circulated throughout Los Angeles today.

The nationally circulated petition was initiated by Elmer A. Benson, former Governor of Minnesota; Reubent W. Borough, California vice chairman of the Independent Progressive Party; D. A. J. Carlson, professor emeritus, University of Chicago.

#### OTHER SIGNERS

Also Fyke Farmer, Nashville, Tenn., attorney; Rt. Rev. Walter Mitchell, Episcopal bishop (retired), Arizona; Stanley Moffatt, former Los Angeles County judge; Rev. George L. Paine, Episcopal minister, Cambridge; William L. Patterson, national executive secretary, Civil Rights Congress; Willard B. Ransom, Indianapolis attorney; Thomas L. Slater, secretary-treasurer, Carpenters Local No. 1, Chicago; and Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, professor emeritus of Wellesley College, Massachusetts.

The petition is being distributed locally by the Los Angeles Civil Rights Congress, 326 West Third Street.

#### BLOT ON JUSTICE

More than 100 other ministers, rabbis, lawyers, teachers, and other leaders are listed as cosponsors of the petition, which declares that the use of paid informers "is a blot on justice in this land."

"From the days of Judas," the signers say, "all nations and faiths have stigmatized informers. Yet today the Government of the United States rests what it asserts are efforts to achieve internal security largely on precisely such purchasable individuals."

"Such an atmosphere," says the petition, "can only be disastrous to the moral fabric of this country."

**Mr. SOURWINE.** This is another article from the Daily People's World, Tuesday, February 8.

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I haven't seen that paper in 4 or 5 years, I guess. I don't believe I could identify or say I have read that.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** You are just making a speech, Mr. Matusow.

**Mr. MATUSOW.** It is clarifying the record, I think.

**Mr. SOURWINE** (continuing). Stating as follows:

The California Emergency Defense Committee announced today that a leaflet will be off the press this week relating the Harvey Matusow I-lied-for-the-FBI confessions to the frameup nature of the California Smith Act convictions.

I offer that for the record.

**The CHAIRMAN.** That will be admitted.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 20" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT NO. 20

CEDC TO PUBLISH LEAFLET ON MATUSOW

SAN FRANCISCO, February 7. The California Emergency Defense Committee announced today that a leaflet will be off the press this week relating the Harvey Matusow 1-lied-for-the-FBI confessions to the frameup nature of the California Smith Act convictions.

At the same time CEDC urgently noted that the slow progress of its fighting fund drive was jeopardizing the committee's plans for an intensive campaign for reversal of the California Smith Act convictions.

The fund drive goal is \$20,000. Thus far only \$9,185 has been turned in, a bare 45 percent of the total. The drive will continue until the goal is achieved, the committee said.

A formal statement added:

"There are big developments in the fight against the repressive Smith Act.

"Here in California a decision might be expected any day from the circuit court of appeals in the case of 14 Californians sentenced to 5-year prison terms under the infamous law. If the decision is negative, then an all-out fight for the right to a hearing before the Supreme Court will be in prospect.

"In New York a hearing is set for March 10 on motions for a new trial in the case of 13 Smith Act victims against whom Matusow admittedly bore false witness.

"All over the country, as a result of the Matusow disclosures, there is a growing feeling that these Smith Act trials were rigged with perjured testimony.

"This is the time to launch a counteroffensive. That is why our drive for the funds to wage the fight is so urgent."

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Matusow, that the Daily Worker of February 25 carried a story about the Communist Party telling the President that the Matusow case calls for a probe of Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read that in the New York Times.

Mr. SOURWINE. That doesn't answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I read it in the New York Times. Yes, I do know it.

The CHAIRMAN. He asked you if you read it in the Daily Worker.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I read it in the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. The testimony is you did not read it in the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not read it in the Daily Worker. I read it in the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be admitted in evidence.

(The article was marked "Exhibit No. 21" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT NO. 21

CP TELLS PRESIDENT: MATUSOW CASE CALLS FOR PROBE OF BROWNELL, HOOVER

The Communist Party yesterday released the text of a letter addressed to President Eisenhower which calls attention to the revelations of false testimony by Government witness Harvey Matusow in "various Smith Act and other thought-control trials." The letter, signed by the party's national chairman, William Z. Foster, places "definite responsibility" for the use of perjured testimony in these cases "upon the heads of the Department of Justice, Mr. Herbert Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover."

The letter follows:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The present scandal over the false testimony of the Government witness Harvey Matusow in various Smith Act and other thought-control trials, shows that these have sunk to the lowest levels of the worst legal frameups in the history of the United States—those of Parsons and Spies, Mooney and Billings, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro Boys, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, and many others.

Two things have been made clear by the disgraceful situation: The first is that the whole informer-stoolpigeon system, by which large numbers of Communists and other progressive citizens are being railroaded to penitentiaries or deported, is thoroughly rotten and a disgrace to the American people. The whole collection of these professional informers, without exception, are deliberate liars.

This was simply proven during the course of the recent Communist trials, as well as in the other proceedings where these witnesses were used to send innocent men and women to jail.

Matusow, with his shocking stories of coached perjury on the witness stand, is not an exceptional instance of such testimony, but the norm for informer witnesses. All the rest of such witnesses are as guilty as he is.

The second fact made clear by the current perjury exposures is that the professional slanderers have been systematically primed with lies by the prosecutors in charge of the trials in question. This puts a definite responsibility upon the heads of the Department of Justice, Herbert Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover. It is inconceivable that these officials have not been aware of the systematic lying that has been committed by the score or more of the professional informer witnesses, speaking in the name of and with the blessing of United States prosecuting attorneys.

In this situation, four things are indispensable to do in order to at least partially cleanse the Government administration of justice of the foul mess of this organized informer-perjury system.

First, the Communists and others jailed under the testimony of the professional informer witnesses should be promptly released.

Second, all persons victimized through loss of jobs, etc., by reason of testimony at congressional investigations be restored to their jobs.

Third, Mr. Brownell and Mr. Hoover should be immediately suspended from their official functions and a thorough-going Senate Judiciary Committee investigation be made of the gross mismanagement of their offices, including the use of paid informers and the subornation of perjury by Government officials.

Fourth, an end should be put to thought-control trials, which violate every principle of American democracy.

The Government's central charge against the Communist Party, that it teaches and advocates the violent overthrow of the United States Government, is palpably false, as even a cursory study of the program and history of our party shows. The charge can be (and has been) supported in court only on the basis of such flagrant and organized perjury as Matusow has exposed.

The evil must be struck at the root. The near-fascist Taft-Hartley, Smith, McCarran, McCarran-Walter, and Communist Control Acts, and other thought-control legislation must be (and eventually will be) stricken from the statute books. Their basic purpose is to intimidate and persecute all those who dare to speak out against the aggressive prowar policy which your administration is now following.

MR. SOURWINE. Do you know independent of what you read in the New York Times—

MR. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(The witness consults with counsel.)

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you know, independently of what you read in the New York Times, that the national chairman of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, had used the occasion of your self-accusations to address a letter to the President of the United States asking for an investigation of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

MR. MATUSOW. I read that in the New York Times, sir. It was the first time and only time I heard of it.

MR. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, are you familiar with an article which appeared in the Nation entitled "The Informer"?

MR. MATUSOW. Last April, I believe, or March.

MR. SOURWINE. I hold in my hand a reprint of this article, dated April 10. Have you seen that before?

MR. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us, Mr. Matusow, why this Nation article, *The Informer*, which excoriates various former Communists who have given testimony against the Communist Party, does not include any mention of Harvey Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it mentions me there, sir. I do not believe I read it that fully.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where does it mention it?

Mr. MATUSOW. If I may have it, I would show it to you.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is quite likely your familiarity with this is greater than that of counsel. I wish you would show the point at which this is mentioned.

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the record should show that this is a reprint of the article that appeared in the Nation magazine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I believe I already stated that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry; I didn't hear you, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. While you are examining that, Mr. Matusow, let me ask you, did you have anything to do with the publication or preparation of that article?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I did not.

I quote, if I may, from page 10 of that magazine article.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you read where it mentions you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

Attempts have therefore been made to intimidate the press through the use of informers' testimony. Harvey Matusow, employed for a time as an investigator by the Ohio Un-American Committee, charged in a political speech in Montana in 1952 that 126 dues-paying Communists were on the Sunday staff of the New York Times—whose entire Sunday staff numbers 93. Matusow went on to say that, "On the editorial and research staffs of *Time* and *Life* there are 76 hard-core Reds, and in the New York bureau of the Associated Press there are 25 Communists."

McCarthy later announced that he intended to retain Matusow to investigate Communist infiltration in the press, radio, and television in New York.

That is the end of the quote in the story dealing with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, can you tell the committee, in view of your familiarity with this document, how it happens that the people who are named in here are the same ones that you have several times sought before this committee to excoriate?

Mr. MATUSOW. You mean the people in that article who are called "informers" and "stool pigeons" are the same ones whom I have been part of and worked with?

Mr. SOURWINE. No; the same ones that you have here several times sought to excoriate.

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Crouch is mentioned there, and he has been caught in lies in testimony. I know him quite well. I belong to the Federation of Former Communists with Mr. Crouch. He has set up an organization of ex-Communists to gather information for these committees.

This is not something I take lightly. I have corresponded with Mr. Crouch, dealing with this Federation of Former Communists. I have met with Mr. Manning Johnson on a number of occasions. I have met Mr. Budenz. I have conversed with these people. Contrary to what Miss Bentley thinks and says, I did have dinner with her on October 3, 1952, and she did cry in her beer and say she did not have new information. She said she did not have any new information. She is a liar and she admitted so in substance that night.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are making another speech.

While you are on the subject, we will follow your lead this far.

Mr. MATUSOW. One other thing, sir.

I will take a lie test with Miss Bentley or anybody else to prove who is telling the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the questions.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, will you state to the committee just a single occasion on which, to your knowledge, Elizabeth Bentley lied under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I stated to the committee on the basis of a conversation with Miss Bentley on the evening of October 3, 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. He asked you of your own personal knowledge. Answer his question.

Mr. MATUSOW. My personal knowledge is she did not enumerate the times in which she gave false testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you of your own personal knowledge know of one instance in which Louis Budenz gave false testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the record is clear in the Lattimore case on the number of occasions he must have given false testimony, and I believe he did.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is: Do you know of your own personal knowledge of one instance in which he did?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't read every word of Mr. Budenz' testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. You stated he gave false testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated I believe he gave false testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Of your own personal knowledge, when did he give such false testimony? Name the incident that was false, to your knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. I personally believe every time Mr. Budenz has testified he has given false testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. When? Every time he has testified.

The CHAIRMAN. Point to one fact on which he swore falsely, to your personal knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. When he denied knowing Owen Lattimore, left it out of his book and magazine pieces that he wrote, and then on the witness stand he said the same thing. I know I lied, and I believe he lied.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own personal knowledge that he did?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe he did.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not responsive. You can answer the question "Yes" or "No," and I am ordering you to answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer, I believe, is he did, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of your own knowledge of a single incident where he swore falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. There were contradictory statements.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer my question "Yes" or "No." Do you know of your own knowledge—then if you answer "Yes" or "No," I have some questions to ask you.

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer will have to be "No," sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then, as a matter of fact, you did not testify that Owen Lattimore was a Communist, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I called him a Communist front, or somebody who believed in Communist ideas and whose books carried forth the Communist Party line, and I had no knowledge of any such thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Weren't you careful to testify that only in your own opinion Mr. Lattimore was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I was very careful then.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he at the time, in your opinion, a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. And Mr. Lattimore denied the charges I made against him under oath at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you know of your own knowledge of one instance in which Paul Crouch lied under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I can come back tomorrow morning and give you a string of instances. I will give you one instance, sir, specifically. In the trial in Philadelphia of Communist leaders—

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you present?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you don't know anything about it of your own knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. The hairsplitting starts again; you are right.

Mr. SOURWINE. The answer is you do not know of your own knowledge of any incident on which Mr. Crouch lied?

Mr. MATUSOW. On the basis of rules of evidence, I do not know of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know perfectly well that you cannot testify.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know Paul Crouch. I know he is a liar.

The CHAIRMAN. You will have to wait until counsel finishes his question. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know quite well, do you not, that you cannot testify concerning a man having lied unless you were present.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know him well enough. I have talked to him enough. I know he is a liar.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is considerably different from your saying that he lied on any particular occasion.

Mr. MATUSOW. If reading the court record in two different proceedings, showing definite contradictory statements by a witness is not of my own knowledge, then I have nothing of my own knowledge. But he has given contradictory statements under oath.

Mr. SOURWINE. So have you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I admit it, but he doesn't.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of your own knowledge of any occasion when Manning Johnson told a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe when he accused Dr. Ralph Bunche of being a Communist, that he lied, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether this article, *The Informer*, by Frank Donner, was a Communist-inspired article?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Mr. Frank J. Donner is a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. I ask that this article be made an exhibit, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be entered in the record as an exhibit.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit 22" and will be found in the files of the subcommittee.)

Mr. SOURWINE. You will remember your testimony a few minutes ago about having known Marion Bachrach as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You also testified that you knew certain members of the national executive committee as Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did it happen that an unknown kid knew all these party big-shots?

Mr. MATUSOW. They lectured at Communist Party conventions, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, when did you leave the east coast for Salt Lake City to testify at the hearings of this committee there in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. I left on the morning of Saturday, October 4. It might have been at noon, it might have been at 10 or 11. I got on United Air Lines plane for Chicago. I left the plane in Chicago, made a speech on Sunday evening in Libertyville, Ill., and on Monday, October 6, I arrived in Salt Lake City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the speech, the Libertyville speech, in which you have testified you referred inaccurately to Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the speech in which I inaccurately attacked Bishop Oxnam, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of the Methodist Church.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, in fact, in this speech say anything at all about Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall mentioning him in that speech.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to know if you will testify that you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I did attack Bishop Oxnam in that speech.

Mr. SOURWINE. If witnesses should appear before this committee who heard that speech and say that you did not, would you continue to testify that you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. If a number of witnesses said I didn't, they might have better recollections than I, but my recollection is still that I attacked Bishop Oxnam in that speech. I attacked Bishop Oxnam and the Methodist Federation of Social Action and a few other Methodist organizations. I remember it quite well.

Mr. SOURWINE. In the speech at Libertyville?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. It was in a Methodist church out there.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was before the Libertyville Sunday Evening Club, was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, not as evidence of what happened, but as evidence of what has been printed, and for the committee's consideration in deciding whether to call witnesses on this point, I offer for the record the front page of the Independent Register of Libertyville, Ill., for Thursday, February 17, which carries a 2-column head on the left-hand side, "Ex-Red Did Not Mention Bishop in Address Here. Reveal Matusow Did Not Say Oxnam's Name Here." And then it quotes the Reverend A. C. Nesmith, pastor of the First Methodist Church, to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Admitted in the record.

(The article referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 23" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT NO. 23

EX-RED DID NOT MENTION BISHOP IN ADDRESS HERE

REVEAL MATUSOW DID NOT SAY OXNAM'S NAME HERE

Harvey Matusow, a man who describes himself as a former Communist, and an ex-FBI informer, who says he was encouraged by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (Republican, Wisconsin) to make false statements during the 1952 political campaign, made no reference to Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam in a speech he made in Libertyville October 5, 1952, during which he talked on Communists in the schools, according to Rev. A. C. Nesmith, pastor of the First Methodist Church.

Monday, in New York, it was reported that Matusow told of a meeting with Bishop Oxnam in Washington during which Matusow told the bishop "I want to apologize for a speech I made against you October 5, 1952, in a Methodist Church in Libertyville, Ill."

In that speech Matusow said he had accused the bishop of "supporting Communist fronts."

ENCOURAGED BY JOE

Matusow, testifying Friday at a Federal court hearing on a retrial motion by 12 convicted Communists, said he made "false statements," during the campaign of 3 years ago, and added:

"My manner of presentation and my theme was encouraged by Senator Joseph McCarthy and, in fact, was at the behest of McCarthy and made during the heat of a political campaign."

McCarthy, told in Milwaukee last night of Matusow's testimony, said: "I would have no comment on Matusow at all."

The 12 Communists' appeal for a new trial is based on an affidavit by Matusow that he gave false evidence against them—and with the knowledge of Roy M. Cohn, then an assistant United States attorney at their trial on conspiracy charges.

Cohn, also in Milwaukee Friday night, commented:

"I won't dignify his pack of lies. He (Matusow) has adequately described himself."

Matusow also testified Friday he had sent affidavits to the New York Times and to Time magazine saying he had lied in accusing them of having Communists on their staffs.

Matusow was brought to Libertyville by the Sunday Evening Club, a community<sup>1</sup> project sponsored by the Methodist Church. Reverend Nesmith said the club had engaged Matusow through a speakers agency which represented Matusow as a former Communist and an undercover agent of the FBI.

During his speech in Libertyville Matusow said the Protestant Church, the public schools and the Boy Scouts were infiltrated by Communists.

"He made general statements and attacks by inference and innuendo. He did not mention Bishop Oxnam," Reverend Nesmith said.

Matusow received \$250 from the Sunday Evening Club for speaking in Libertyville.

The meeting the night Matusow spoke in Libertyville was not well attended. In regards as to how Matusow's speech was taken by those in the audience, Reverend Nesmith said, "Those who wanted to believe did, and those who did not, did not."

At the present time the Department of Justice is checking Matusow's record to find out whether his latest "confession" of making false statements is either more or less creditable than his original testimony against Owen Lattimore.

<sup>1</sup>This word appeared as "communist" in the original story. In the next issue of the paper (on February 24), this correction was published:

"IT'S 'COMMUNITY,' NOT 'COMMUNIST' PROJECT

"Due to a typographical error, the Sunday Evening Club, an organization which was sponsored by the First Methodist Church of Libertyville but does not exist now was incorrectly identified as a 'Communist' project. It should have been identified as a 'community' project."

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you leave Libertyville to return to Chicago?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I caught a 1 o'clock plane out of Chicago that evening. It would have been early Monday morning, October 6.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wasn't it the 10:10 p. m.?

Mr. MATUSOW. It could have been, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went back to Chicago? Did you immediately catch a plane to go to Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I had a drink with a couple of people in a bar near the airport.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you spend the night in Chicago?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you get back from that trip, back to New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. On election day 1952.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure you didn't get back on November first or second?

Mr. MATUSOW. On election day itself.

Mr. SOURWINE. You got back on election day itself?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was it you left Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forgot the exact date. I believe I testified on October 8, 1952, on October 9 or the afternoon of October 8. I got in a car and drove on to Pocatello, Idaho.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have been through that before. I just wanted to get the date.

Mr. MATUSOW. I came back to Salt Lake City on the 14th or 15th. Was there an hour or so and then I went on to Pendleton and Portland, Oreg. and Seattle, Wash., where I met Senator McCarthy. I got caught in a fog and couldn't get back to Salt Lake for a week or so, and went on to New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you board the plane which took you to New York on election day 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. At Las Vegas, Nev., McCarran Field.

Mr. SOURWINE. What date did you board that plane?

Mr. MATUSOW. Midnight of Monday. It was an all night flight.

Mr. SOURWINE. Election day was November 4.

Mr. MATUSOW. Then this was November 3, Monday.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you sure you did not board that airplane on November 1st or 2d?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that it could have been the Monday, the day before election, but that my plane touched down on La Guardia or Idlewild—I believe it was La Guardia Field in New York—touched down on election day at 11 o'clock in the morning. It might have been 10 or it might have been noon.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you sure you didn't arrive in New York on the 1st or 2d of November 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Quite sure. Before I went to bed that day I voted.

Mr. SOURWINE. In New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I hadn't unpacked.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the day you arrived from Las Vegas by airplane, you voted in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. Here is the complete chronology. I had filed for an absentee ballot and I took that with me to the polling place.

Mr. SOURWINE. That same evening you telephoned Mr. J. B. Matthews?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was not in the evening but in the late afternoon.

Mr. SOURWINE. Of election day?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, about 3 or 4 in the afternoon.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was the party at Mrs. Bentley's home in Washington?

Mr. MATUSOW. Election day night.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the same evening?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir. You have testified concerning an occasion on which you said you had dinner with Elizabeth Bentley. That was the third of October 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, it was. It was a Friday.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stated where you had that dinner?

Mr. MATUSOW. At the Rochambeau Restaurant on 11th Street in New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was anybody else present at the table with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have dinner with Elizabeth Bentley on another occasion?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had luncheon with her on another occasion when she also cried.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was after the first meeting. The luncheon meeting was in midtown New York. I don't recall the name of the restaurant. Also present was Mrs. Ruth Matthews, the wife of J. B. Matthews, Miss Bentley, and myself.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have dinner with Elizabeth Bentley on another occasion?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you have dinner on November 16, 1952, at the home of J. B. Matthews?

Mr. MATUSOW. That could have been possible. I couldn't recall that. I have had dinner with J. B. Matthews and a lot of other people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you regard Miss Elizabeth Bentley as one of the most important of the ex-Communists who have given testimony to the Government about the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. One of the most unstable.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer his question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't regard her as important. I regard her as an important liar, not in any other way.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not think her testimony has been important with respect to the Communist Party conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. It has helped create a lot of unfounded hysteria in this country. It has hurt a lot of people.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom has it hurt?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think her testimony has hurt the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You said her testimony has hurt a lot of people.

Mr. MATUSOW. It has hurt the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are those people whom it has hurt?

Mr. MATUSOW. You are one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else?

Mr. MATUSOW. Every member of this committee and every citizen of this country. I am sorry, but I don't know the names of them all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, Miss Bentley, if I may continue, Mr. Chairman—what else do I know about Miss Bentley?

Mr. SOURWINE. Nobody asked you that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I can give you one fact that you can check and find very substantially will back up this story. If the committee wants the facts, you should ask me about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Volunteer your information.

Mr. MATUSOW. In March 1952 Miss Bentley was due to testify before the Subversive Activities Control Board here in Washington. The date in fact was the day I took the stand. She was supposed to have been the witness. The Justice Department attorneys presented to the Board and to the other attorneys a letter from Miss Bentley's doctor saying she was not physically capable. As it so happens, she was not in an emotional state of mind, ready or able to testify in that proceeding. That state of mind continued with Miss Bentley until after she went to work as a teacher in Louisiana. I believe that is where she is teaching. During this period she continuously cried and threatened people, saying, "You either give me a full-time job, or I am not going to testify any more. I don't have any new information."

She was pretty upset and very unstable, more so than I was at the time. The Government knew about it, when the Government did not put her on the stand in the case of the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board in March 1952.

The Government had a letter from her doctor stating that.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your point?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Government should have known better than to use her or to use her since then. She made statements about Mr. White, which may or may not have been true, but after this period, when the Government knew she was unstable, and her doctor said she was not qualified to be a witness in March 1952. The galley proofs of her book and the manuscript of her book have many, many facts in it which are not the same, many obviously which her publisher said, "You must take out of the book because they are not things you can prove, and they are not true."

In one thing, in the galley of her book—and this has been reported publicly—

Senator DANIEL. Is he testifying of his own knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am testifying as to the medical certificate that was given to the Government, of my own knowledge.

Senator DANIEL. As to what the publisher told Miss Bentley?

Mr. MATUSOW. You wanted the facts.

Senator DANIEL. I ask you if that was of your own knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. My own knowledge of the difference between the galley and the final version of her book? I think the committee should investigate that to find the facts.

Senator DANIEL. Are you testifying of your own knowledge about the publisher telling her what to take out of her book?

Mr. MATUSOW. The difference between the galleys and the final book show that much was taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know from my own knowledge. I know of the difference between the galleys and the final version of the book. That is the point the committee ought to investigate in relation to Miss Bentley.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, are you telling the committee that a person who has at any time had crying jags and a medical certificate that at that time he or she was unfit to testify, should never have his word accepted for any purpose: is that your view?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said—and I should say now, if it wasn't clear before—that a person who was under a doctor's care, emotionally unstable, who said, "I will not be a witness unless I am paid for being a witness," who said, "I have to get new information in order to make a living," a person who makes those statements should be screened a little more thoroughly than Miss Bentley was screened.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was it that Miss Bentley told she would not testify unless she was paid?

Mr. MATUSOW. She told me that.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else did she tell—

Mr. MATUSOW. I think—

The CHAIRMAN. You are charging something against the Government attorneys. Do you mean to say she told the Government attorneys—

Mr. MATUSOW. She told me she told two FBI agents who visited her in her Connecticut home.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you, sir, about the Government attorneys who prepared the affidavit. You have testified that she told them that she would not testify unless she was paid.

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say that. The record doesn't read that way. The record does not read that way.

Senator WELKER. You have stated that you believe that Miss Bentley should never have her word accepted.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Senator WELKER. Under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you want to tell the committee that this committee or any other committee or any other tribunal should never accept your word under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Anybody who goes before a committee and is making a living at being a witness is somebody I would doubt. I have been that type of witness. Miss Bentley has been that type, and is that type, of witness. That is what I am saying, sir.

Senator WELKER. You once made your living doing that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I admit that, sir. That is why I am here now to try to undo some of the harm.

Senator WELKER. The question is when and where were you lying? Would you ask any tribunal, any congressional committee, or anyone else to ever accept your word under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am asking you to accept my word now, because it is the truth. It is not motivated by money, fear, greed, or need, but by truth and conscience.

Senator WELKER. We will go into that matter about the money, fear, greed, and need. I remember your words in your book. I will take you on a little later on that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Glad to.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified that Miss Bentley was broke and she could not get employment of any kind?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Despite everything she had done for her country?

Mr. MATUSOW. A few weeks after—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have been closely bordering on contempt many times in your aggressive attitude toward the committee and your interruption of questions. Try to restrain yourself.

That was true, in spite of everything she had done for her country in exposing the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know how much she has done for her country.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, on the basis of your testimony about Miss Bentley's financial condition, would you say that the journalists and radio commentators and others who have given currency to the charge that ex-Communists who have exposed communism have done so from motives of personal greed might be wrong about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the ex-Communists, most of the ex-Communists have done so for motives of personal greed or fear.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that they could wind up broke like Miss Bentley?

Mr. MATUSOW. Miss Bentley said she bought a home and paid so many thousands of dollars for a brand-new home up in Connecticut with the proceeds of a book she wrote, a so-called expose of communism. She didn't have to buy a home. She spent her money on a home and couldn't get another job.

Senator WELKER. May I have a question on the subject matter counsel is interrogating about, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. With respect to the words "fear, greed and need," directing your attention, Mr. Witness, to page 126, the chapter 10, under the subtitle, a "Law Named Smith," second paragraph:

I ask myself, as many of you might ask, how could I believe one thing so strongly and then turn completely around? The answer can be summed up for me in three words—fear, greed and need.

Now, would you like to describe and discuss that to the committee, please? Fear, greed and need.

Mr. MATUSOW. Gladly, sir.

Senator WELKER. That you used just a moment ago. I told you I would come back to it.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is that the same reason why you have abused Miss Bentley here; fear, greed and need?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think she has lived under the fear, greed and need; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You admit you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I think most ex-Communist witnesses have and do.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe most ex-Communist professional witnesses are motivated basically by fear, greed and need.

Senator WELKER. Who do you fear?

Mr. MATUSOW. These committees.

Senator WELKER. You fear the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did at one time.

Senator WELKER. Did anybody ever go out and handcuff you and ask you to come in before us?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think a lot of people have been intimidated.

Senator WELKER. I am asking about you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody ever handcuffed me. I don't fear the committee now.

Senator WELKER. You came voluntarily?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. What was the greed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I found I could make an easy living, and other witnesses found they could make an easy living.

Senator WELKER. You made an easy living?

Mr. MATUSOW. Of course, sir.

Senator WELKER. In 1952 your living wasn't so easy. You were broke when you went to Wisconsin?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was extremely good in 1952.

Senator WELKER. I read some place in your book—and I will find that—wherein you asked—

Mr. MATUSOW. I have been broke on a number of occasions.

Senator WELKER. There is no question about that. You were telling me how easy it was to make a living.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sure it was.

Senator WELKER. In 1952 in the State of Wisconsin you had to ask for \$300; am I right or wrong?

Mr. MATUSOW. I asked for the money that was to be paid me for campaigning in Wisconsin, yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. That was the—

Mr. MATUSOW. \$350, I believe, is the official figure.

Senator WELKER. I understood it was three.

Mr. MATUSOW. The State of Wisconsin has just come out and said \$350.

Senator WELKER. I am not talking about greed in terms of \$50.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. What is your description of need?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, if you want to go into that, we can. The question of trying to get along in this world when you have been a Communist, and having to go all the way over to the extreme right politically and attack other Communists, rather than dropping out of the Communist Party.

The need of self, shall we say, self-respect in a society, in a country where you can only have self-respect if you inform on your neighbors and your friends.

Senator WELKER. That word which you hated so viciously at one time, informer and stool pigeon?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Could it have anything to do with the word "need" for writing a book, from which you could receive some profit?

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated the other day—and I state it again—that the proceeds from this book will go to charity, sir.

Senator WELKER. I don't care what you stated before. I want to hear your statement now.

Mr. MATUSOW. I state it again now.

Senator WELKER. Could need have anything to do at all with your having somebody publish a book called *The False Witness*?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that you knew or ought to have known that one of the labor unions that you maligned in your so-called false testimony had purchased thousands of copies of this so-called book in advance?

Mr. MATUSOW. I found out after the book was written that this union had purchased thousands of copies.

Senator WELKER. You made no objection to that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You knew also, did you not, that this so-called book was to go beyond the Iron Curtain in many countries?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know that, sir.

Senator WELKER. And to other labor unions that you now say you maligned when you testified under oath in my neighboring State, the State of Utah, the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. You know that, don't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you realize that they, too, bought some thousands of copies of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is the only union I know that bought thousands of volumes. You are telling me something I didn't know, if there is any other union.

Senator WELKER. Isn't it true? Did you inquire of Mr. Kahn or Mr. Cameron?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Or the—I don't know how to describe him, whether he is your bodyguard or your aide.

Mr. MATUSOW. Just a friend.

Senator WELKER. A friend that you have known less than a month?

Mr. MATUSOW. A friend nevertheless.

Senator WELKER. While we are on this subject of fear, greed and need, when did you last work for a living?

Mr. MATUSOW. As late as October of 1954 until I started writing this book.

Senator WELKER. October of 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When was the last time you accepted any money from the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was a member of the Communist Party.

Senator WELKER. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1950.

Senator WELKER. And that was only for expenses?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You received no salary whatsoever?

Mr. MATUSOW. None whatsoever.

Senator WELKER. What was your income from, other than your expenses there?

Mr. MATUSOW. At that time?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I drove a taxicab for a while.

Senator WELKER. How many days, and where?

Mr. MATUSOW. A week or so in Albuquerque. I went to school under the GI bill of rights in Taos.

Senator WELKER. You didn't save any money on that, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You didn't drive a taxicab for a couple of weeks in Albuquerque?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been 10 days or 2 weeks, just about.

Senator WELKER. I think that is where you testified you did a little bootlegging.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sold bootleg whisky after 2 in the morning, after the bars were closed.

Senator WELKER. Did you save any money as a result of that job?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Give the time and date of that, please.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was in January–February 1951.

Senator WELKER. Your next gainful employment?

Mr. MATUSOW. United States Air Force.

Senator WELKER. When was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1951, from February to December.

Senator WELKER. That terminated when?

Mr. MATUSOW. December.

Senator WELKER. Did you have any savings at the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did.

Senator WELKER. You did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. How much?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall offhand, maybe a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars.

Senator WELKER. That was in 1951?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Where did you get that money?

Mr. MATUSOW. I worked after hours at the airbase.

Senator WELKER. Doing what?

Mr. MATUSOW. With the permission of the PX officer down at Brooks, I set up for altering uniforms, sewing on chevrons for NCO's. It was part of the PX setup. When I went to Dayton—

Senator WELKER. Let's stay down here. I want to get that. Where was it set up and what did you do?

Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody else had set it up, and I took it over when this fellow went overseas.

Senator WELKER. How much an hour did they pay you for that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody paid me by the hour. It was off duty, at night. If there were 10 guys wanting chevrons sewn on their uniform, I had that done for them.

Senator WELKER. How much money did you make out of the 10 guys?

Mr. MATUSOW. Two bits a chevron.

Senator WELKER. \$2.50.

Mr. MATUSOW. Part of it went to the company fund.

Senator WELKER. Do you now want the committee to understand when you got out of the Air Force in December 1951 you had about \$1,000?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the figure. It might have been a thousand dollars.

Senator WELKER. Did you have it in a bank?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I sent some of it to my parents. I send it to them whenever I can, to help them.

Senator WELKER. Did you send it in a money order?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall how I sent it. I might have given it to them on leave.

Senator WELKER. Then what was your next gainful employment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Investigator for the Ohio un-American activities investigation.

Senator WELKER. How long did you stay there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Three months.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make there?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$300 a month, plus expenses.

Senator WELKER. You set that out in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so.

Senator WELKER. How much were you able to save out of living in Columbus?

Mr. MATUSOW. I lived in Dayton.

Senator WELKER. I beg your pardon. You are correct.

How much were you able to save out of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. When did you terminate that employment in Dayton?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was in April.

Senator WELKER. What year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1952.

Senator WELKER. And where did you next work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Did free-lance radio writing and stuff. Did two shows, an experimental show called Out of the Red, on station WING.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make out of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$50.

Senator WELKER. For 2 nights' work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Did you save that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. But you still had this thousand dollars as a nest egg at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not necessarily, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell me how much money you did have when you left Dayton?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember. Maybe two, three, four hundred; maybe five hundred.

Senator WELKER. That is a broad spread.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I don't remember how much money I had in my hand on a specific day.

Senator WELKER. When were you next employed?

Mr. MATUSOW. By a magazine called Counterattack.

Senator WELKER. There you sold subscriptions, and you got \$9 out of every \$24 sold?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was also assistant to the editor.

Senator WELKER. Prior to becoming that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I sold the subscriptions for Counterattack at \$9 a subscription while I was an investigator for the Ohio un-American activities.

Senator WELKER. How much did you make out of that \$9 out of every \$24 of subscriptions?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$9 out of every \$24.

Senator WELKER. How much total?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, you made very little?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not much. It was a nominal fee.

Senator WELKER. You got a percentage on a magazine subscription?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And they didn't sell very readily, as I recall?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. How much did you receive while you were assistant editor?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$70 to \$80 a week, plus—

Senator WELKER. And you were living, I believe, in a cold-water flat in New York; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. The first apartment I had was sublet from Robert Morris, who was then counsel for this committee. I lived on 73d Street.

Senator WELKER. How much did you pay for that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. Then I moved into a cold-water flat in Greenwich Village and fixed an apartment up.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much money, at all, you saved out of your salary from Counterattack?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much spent for food, or anything?

Mr. MATUSOW. I usually spent a lot of money. I used to.

Senator WELKER. You do recall that in the fall of 1952, according to your own book, you were flat broke, and you had to ask for money in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I was flat broke in the fall of 1952; quite the reverse. I was living it up pretty good in the fall of 1952.

Senator WELKER. In other words, eating high on the hog?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. If I remember correctly.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I was flying around in chartered airplanes.

Senator WELKER. I don't think you did. I believe the committee did.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did on 2 or 3 occasions.

Senator WELKER. Did you pay for it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody else paid for it. It was put at my disposal. That is living pretty high.

Senator WELKER. With somebody else paying for it.

Mr. MATUSOW. What difference does it make if the money was paid by somebody else or came out of my pocket? I was doing the heavy living.

Senator WELKER. What else did you do in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. I made some money to escort a witness out of the jurisdiction of the Hennings committee, take her out of the country to Nassau, so she wouldn't have to testify about McCarthy.

Senator WELKER. How much did you get from the Hennings committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't get anything from the Hennings committee.

Senator WELKER. Who was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Arvilla P. Bentley. The witness paid me.

Senator WELKER. How much did she pay you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had a nice vacation in the Bahamas.

Senator WELKER. I am asking you how much money she paid you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will break it down for you. About a thousand dollars hotel bill that she paid for, \$300 set of golf clubs that she bought me, plus maybe three or four or five hundred dollars for 2 weeks' work.

Senator WELKER. You don't recall how much folding money you got?

Mr. MATUSOW. Four or five hundred dollars.

Senator WELKER. It could have been \$150?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was higher than that. I can assure you.

Senator WELKER. \$250?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was closer to four.

Senator WELKER. Your first answer was \$250.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was closer to 400.

Senator WELKER. Where is Mrs. Bentley now?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Senator WELKER. How did she pay you? In cash or by check?

Mr. MATUSOW. Paid me in cash.

Senator WELKER. Did you later become married to her?

Mr. MATUSOW. On two occasions.

Senator WELKER. You were married to her when she paid you the money?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. How much net money did you save as a result of that trip out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir, because a couple of days after I got back I went to Texas to do a job for the Texas Pacific Railroad, before a Labor Relations Board. They paid me \$800 for 24 hours' work. That included transportation, which came to about 250.

Senator WELKER. How much money do you have now?

Mr. MATUSOW. In my pocket?

Senator WELKER. No; your total assets.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. A couple or three hundred dollars, maybe.

Senator WELKER. Where did you get that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Earned it.

Senator WELKER. From whom?

Mr. MATUSOW. Partly in night-club work I have done since October 1952.

Senator WELKER. Night-club work?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I do night-club work.

Senator WELKER. Was that as an actor?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. What sort of act do you put on?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, at one point I satirized the Army-McCarthy hearings. I would do the voices of the various characters in that proceeding as if it were a baseball game.

Senator WELKER. After your acting experience, what else did you do?

Mr. MATUSOW. I made money at that. That is how I do it.

Senator WELKER. When was the last time you appeared in a night club?

Mr. MATUSOW. A room called the Salle de Champion on Macdougal Street.

Senator WELKER. When?

Mr. MATUSOW. Six to seven weeks ago.

Senator WELKER. How long did you appear there?

Mr. MATUSOW. For about a week.

Senator WELKER. How much did you receive for that week?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the exact amount. I have done independent club dates, birthday parties for children.

Senator WELKER. With the wonderful memory you have on things you want to remember, you cannot tell us how much you received for appearing in a famous night club in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is not a famous club. It is just a night club.

Senator WELKER. I would remember it if I had appeared for a week in a night club.

Mr. MATUSOW. I keep a record of it. I have other things on my mind.

Senator WELKER. How much have you received from the publishers of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Since October I have received approximately \$1,500, at the rate of about \$50 a week in advance on this book.

Senator WELKER. And you tell me now you have \$300?

Mr. MATUSOW. Approximately. It might be \$250.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that they have been paying your expenses since that time? You are down to \$300?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I have a few debts that I incurred when I was living high up on the hog, as you phrased it, and when I get a few extra dollars, I will try to pay those debts off.

Senator WELKER. That is about all at this time.

Senator HENNINGS. I don't know whether I understood you to say that you did or did not receive any money from a committee of which I happened to have been chairman in 1952.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. The answer was I received money from somebody who was supposed to have been a witness before your committee, to take her out of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Senator HENNINGS. Is that the Committee on Privileges and Elections?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. And you were paid to take a witness, subpoenaed by our committee, out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe the witness had been subpoenaed, but one of your investigators, or the committee's investigators, had attempted to get service upon that witness, and I believe the attorney for the witness said that the witness would be available in a day or

so, and the committee member took the attorney at his word. That was the day before Thanksgiving 1952. However, on Thanksgiving Day the witness left Washington, and I accompanied the witness, under the witness' maiden name.

Senator HENNINGS. Who was that witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. Arvilla Peterson Bentley.

Senator HENNINGS. Who was the lawyer who made the arrangement for you to take the witness out of the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. He knew about it. He didn't make any arrangements for it. Arrangements were made by Dr. J. B. Matthews.

Senator HENNINGS. For you to transport the witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. To accompany the witness.

Senator HENNINGS. From the United States to where?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nassau, in the British Bahamas.

Senator HENNINGS. There is just one thing, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Senator HENNINGS. I don't want to unnecessarily interfere with Mr. Sourwine's investigation. I understood you to say something about this being a country where you could only have self-respect if you bore witness against another?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was the way I felt when I became a witness. I felt that by just dropping out of the Communist Party and maybe reporting to the FBI, but never testifying, it would be sufficient because my neighbors and other people still accused me—or I believed would have accused me, as the Air Force did—of being a Communist, and it was not sufficient to furnish objective facts to the FBI. But I felt—and other witnesses who talked to me felt—that same way, that they must get up publicly and cleanse their souls, so to speak, and denounce other people, for people in their communities to begin to accept them once again.

Senator HENNINGS. I was somewhat intrigued—I don't know if my colleagues on this committee who were on it last year may or may not have heard of the Federation of Former Communists. I had never heard of that organization, Mr. Matusow.

That federation, is it incorporated under any pro forma decrees of any State?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it is incorporated here in the District of Columbia, and my recollection is that Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin, former Congressman Kersten, introduced in the record of the Congressional Record statements about this Federation of Former Communists, and the fact that it had been incorporated, and at one time I was a member of the committee, the national committee, or executive body—I forget which.

Senator HENNINGS. And you have chapters of this federation in various cities?

Mr. MATUSOW. There were attempts made to set up chapters of this Federation of Former Communists.

Senator HENNINGS. Do you know who the president of that organization is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Paul Crouch, as far as I knew, conceived the idea, and he was the leader of it, and I have had correspondence with him. I will endeavor to locate such correspondence, if you would like, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. I think it might be very interesting, and possibly very illuminating.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I forward it to your office, or to the committee?

Senator HENNINGS. To the committee, if you please, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will attempt to do that.

Senator HENNINGS. Have you ever paid dues to that Federation of Former Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have given a financial contribution to the Federation of Former Communists; yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. Do you remember to whom you gave the payment you say you made?

Mr. MATUSOW. To Mr. Paul Crouch. It was sent by mail. I have a letter showing he received it.

Senator HENNINGS. Have you been to meetings of this organization or any of its branches anywhere in the country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have discussed it in the form of an informal meeting at his home in Washington.

Senator HENNINGS. But you have never been at any meetings of the so-called Federation of Former Communists, as such?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. You just understand, I assume, that such an organization exists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have correspondence to that effect.

Senator HENNINGS. Or that they are trying to start one?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was under the impression that that charter or incorporation certificate had already been gotten.

Senator HENNINGS. Under some pro forma decree, you believe?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator HENNINGS. Or some other such legal device.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. Are you married now?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Are you divorced now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you become divorced?

Mr. MATUSOW. First time, on August 25, 1953, and again on September 28, 1953, both divorces obtained in Reno, Nev. The first one in the first district court, and the second in the second district court.

Senator WELKER. Did you appear there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I signed a waiver.

Senator WELKER. Do you know where your wife is at this time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Senator WELKER. You don't know whether she is in the United States, or in Nassau, or Panama?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir.

Senator WELKER. Haven't heard from her since the divorce?

Mr. MATUSOW. I saw her once; spoke to her once, briefly. That was all. That was a year or a year and a half ago.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you remember testifying in court concerning your conference at the Delmonico Hotel with Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. You are referring to Judge Dimock's court?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall some testimony on that subject.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall testifying that you told them:

I have seven criticisms of the Communist Party, but this is not what I intended to deal with in this book. I wanted to deal with my activities after I left the Communist Party.

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance. I might have said that, but that is the substance of my remarks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, why did you think it important to tell Cameron & Kahn that your book would not deal with any criticisms of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I said the book would not have any criticisms of the Communist Party. I said I believed the main subject of the book would be the activities engaged in after leaving the Communist Party, because I felt that enough people had written books about what the Communist Party was like, and I felt it was time that somebody wrote a book to say what the anti-Communist right wing movement was like in this country, not in a pro- or anti-Communist way.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what you testified to in court?

Mr. MATUSOW. They were prospective publishers at the time of my book, and I felt the main concern that I had—

The CHAIRMAN. You have answered the question.

(Senator Hennings left the hearing room.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe it is fully answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, it is. Just a minute.

Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your testimony was, Mr. Matusow:

I showed them that report and told them that I am not writing this book in the sense that it is pro-Communist or anti-Communist, and that I have certain criticisms of the Communist Party, but this is not what I intended to deal with in this book. I want to deal with my activities after I left the Communist Party. At this meeting I didn't say I gave false testimony in those words, as I said Friday, I had an obsession about the term "lie." I wouldn't use it. I talked in general about the testimony and I said specifically to them that in the book I am not doing it to be used by anybody. If the Communist Party uses it, it is not because it was written as a pro-Communist document, because I am not pro-Communist, but rather I am going to tell the truth in this book, and if anybody can use the truth, they are welcome to it.

Why did you think, Mr. Matusow, that the Communist Party would use your book if Cameron & Kahn published it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I felt they would use any book, regardless of who published it, because I had things to say about my bearing false witness against Communist Party leaders.

To complete the answer, if the book had been published by Simon & Schuster or Doubleday, or one of the so-called legitimate publishing houses, I am certain the Communist Party could make greater use of my book than the fact that it was published by Cameron & Kahn, whom this committee and the press have accused of being pro-Communist, or left-wing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you give us the names of all individuals about whom you know, who aided in research for or supplied any material for your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I can do that very briefly. You, sir, are one person, because I have a document signed by you. The committees and the reports before these committees have also furnished me with

information through the publication of such reports. The letters I have received from various people, Members of the Senate, House of Representatives, from staff members of certain committees, have aided me in the research and development of this book. Mr. Kahn at one time helped, because I asked him to get transcripts of certain testimony which I had given, which I didn't have.

A Miss Janice, who took the dictation, helped in the fact that she took the dictation. I don't believe Mr. Cameron helped in any way. I believe Mr. Witt told me, after reading the copy of the chapter on the Salt Lake City hearings, that it was not a national convention of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Union, but a legislative conference, or some such thing. And certain newspapers which published reports about my activities in the past, such as the New York Times and the Tribune, the newspapers in Idaho, in Pocatello, in Idaho Falls, the Salt Lake City newspapers, the El Paso newspapers, the Washington, D. C. newspapers, have helped me in research.

I have used that material. And on that subject, sir, I believe I said the other day I would bring in the proofed copies of the documentation in the book, if the committee wants them. I have them here. I believe that is partly in answer to your question.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Mr. Matusow, haven't you confused the material you used with my question about individuals who supplied material for your book?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** Individuals are Mr. Kahn, who obtained for me the transcript, certain members of the United States Senate, who have written me letters which I reproduced in my book. Staff investigators for a senatorial committee who have corresponded with me. Correspondence from members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Air Force of the United States in issuing an order to me, putting me on temporary duty with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, plus their published reports. These are the places that furnished me with material which I used. Nobody furnished it to me other than the people who corresponded with me.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** That is what I am trying to get at.

**Mr. MATUSOW.** All right, sir.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Some people did furnish you material for your book, knowing what it was for?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** Mr. Kahn did.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Was he the only one?

(Senator Daniel left the room at this point.)

**Mr. MATUSOW.** I believe a friend of mine, an assistant to the editor of the New York Post at one time furnished me with a copy of a newspaper article which had appeared in the New York Post, that I asked him to get for me.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** Who was that?

**Mr. MATUSOW.** His name was Duffty. I believe Mr. Drew Pearson, upon my request, furnished me with photostatic copies of certain notes written to me by Arvilla Bentley during the trip to Nassau. That is something I just remembered, specifically because I wanted to use it in my book. I believe I asked Mr. Carey McWilliams of the Nation magazine to furnish me with a copy of that article entitled "The Informer" prior to my writing the book.

**Mr. SOURWINE.** What is—

Mr. MATUSOW. For the purpose of writing the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is Mr. Duffty's full name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Bill.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are there any other persons?

Mr. MATUSOW. None that I can recall at this time, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What were the terms of sale of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't hear that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What were the terms of sale of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sale to the public, or sale to the publisher?

Mr. SOURWINE. Your sale to the publisher.

Mr. MATUSOW. The original terms, to the best of my recollection, and if I saw the contract I think I could be more explicit—I believe were to receive \$250 cash advance. It was added up to a total of \$350; \$100 was part of the airline ticket I was sent, making a \$250 total. I believe for 12 weeks \$50 a week, but our agreement was that in the event, at the end of that period, I needed a few additional dollars, maybe three or four hundred dollars, provided I had agreed to the terms of the contract and furnished enough of the book, I would get an additional advance at \$50 a week for X number of weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you sign the formal contract with your publisher?

Mr. MATUSOW. The letter of agreement of October 26, 1954.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that before or after you had filed the affidavit in which you stated that you perjured yourself in the trial of the 13 Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Prior to filing any affidavit where I stated I gave false testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you thereafter sign a second contract with Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. I thereafter signed another contract, by supplemental agreement.

Mr. SOURWINE. Which was more favorable to you than the first one?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; it was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not necessarily. I gave up certain rights which I had retained.

Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It did not. There is a percentage there. But the price of the book had been reduced considerably from the original intent of the price of the book, which meant the royalty which I was to receive per copy was considerably lower. It was then balanced out by a slightly higher royalty, but in the second contract I gave up certain rights which I had retained previously.

Mr. SOURWINE. It called for more money, didn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't it call for a larger amount as a down payment on the book, \$600 more than the first contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. It might be in there.

Mr. SOURWINE. You know it did.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't. I take your word for it.

Mr. SOURWINE. From \$900 to \$1,500; isn't that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't it call for a higher rate of royalty on the hard-backed copies?

Mr. MATUSOW. It called for a higher rate of royalty with a lower book rate. The book was originally scheduled for \$5.

Mr. SOURWINE. Neither contract specified the sale price of the book, did it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It said a minimum price, but Cameron and Kahn and I had an agreement about the price of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Both contracts specified the same minimum, did they not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't the second contract call for a higher percentage, a better percentage?

Mr. MATUSOW. A higher percentage on a lower book price. That was our agreement.

Mr. SOURWINE. They both specified the same minimum book price?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am telling you what the agreement was, and not what you read in the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us that this contract is not your agreement with Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is our agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is the contract? Do you have a copy?

Mr. SOURWINE. The contract is in our records.

All right, sir, I will leave that point. Was the final contract, Mr. Matusow, the contract which the record will show was either better, or not better than the first contract; was that final contract signed before or after you offered your affidavit in the Federal court recanting your testimony against some of the 13 second-string Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. The supplemental contract was signed after my signing of the affidavit, for good reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the reason?

Mr. MATUSOW. The contract was agreed to prior to that, but Mr. Cameron had been in the Adirondacks with his sick wife, and could not come to New York, and we were unable to get his signature on the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you knew before you signed the affidavits you were going to get a better contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew I was going to get a supplemental contract. As I stated, it is not a better contract, it is basically the same contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was decided before you signed the affidavits?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was decided before I finished the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew you were going to get the other supplemental contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had the contract all along.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't get it until after you signed the affidavits, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because Mr. Cameron was unavailable to finish drawing up the contract.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying that you and Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn together signed your contract under date of February 1?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir: I don't remember saying that. I believe the record will say that I signed it with Mr. Kahn, and the contract was sent over to Mr. Cameron's office, where he signed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Who wrote your contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Cameron.

The CHAIRMAN. And your original contract called for \$900 down-payment; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$900 advance.

The CHAIRMAN. Your subsequent contract called for how much advance?

Mr. MATUSOW. The subsequent contract called for \$1,500, because that is how much I had received.

The CHAIRMAN. \$1,500. What was your royalty under the first contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. On the paperbound book, 14 percent of the price to the dealers.

The CHAIRMAN. Fourteen percent?

Mr. MATUSOW. Or \$1.25 per book.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the percentage in the second contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might be off a percent or so, but it said 15 percent for the first 5,000 copies originally. The royalty was to go up to 20 percent for the next 10,000, or the next 5,000, and then up to 25,000.

In the supplemental agreement it called for 15 percent for the first 2,500 copies, 20 percent for the next 5,000, bringing it up to a total of 67,500 books, and 25 percent for all books thereafter.

I have figured the difference in price out, and if on both contracts the 15,000 books were reached, and the original price was the same on both contracts, there would be an advantage to me of \$900 total royalty, and nothing higher, but that is negated by the fact that originally the book was planned to be \$5 for 350 pages, while the book is now 256 pages and will sell for \$3, which makes it a lower royalty rate, and in the ultimate, less money on the second contract than on the first.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember testifying that you and Mr. Cameron and Mr. Kahn together signed your contract under date of February 1?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said we all signed it on February 1. I don't recall stating that the three of us signed it together.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you first state that you signed it together and then subsequently testified that Mr. Cameron was not in town at the time, and he signed it subsequently?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that is how it went. It is quite possible.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your first testimony was:

My recollection is that we signed it together that is, Mr. Kahn and myself, I believe, I signed it first, and then Mr. Kahn did, and Mr. Cameron was the last one to sign it.

You subsequently testified:

Mr. Cameron was not in town at the time, and he signed it subsequent to my signing it, and Mr. Kahn signing it.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to clear that point up in the record. In the signing of this contract, who signed it first?

Mr. MATUSOW. Physically I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then Mr. Kahn signed it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, he was with me at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were together at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, in room 422, Hotel Chelsea.

Mr. SOURWINE. You saw him sign it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. He saw you sign it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then it was sent to Mr. Cameron to sign?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes. He was out of town, or at the office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know when Mr. Cameron signed it?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is he signed it that day. It might have been the next day.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the difference in royalties, haven't you testified under oath the second contract meant a difference of \$800 more in royalty?

Mr. MATUSOW. If both prices had been the same, it would have meant eight or nine hundred dollars additional to me, but the fact is both prices are not the same.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't tell the court if they were the same, you just said it made a difference of about \$800.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am giving you a more clear and precise answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. Than you testified to?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have testified that you did not know that Mine, Mill was going to buy 2,000 copies of your book, until after you had written the book; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Until after I had written the book, and after I had signed any affidavits.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it correct that you did not know of that initial agreement by Mine, Mill to purchase copies of your book until the same time, when you learned that they had subsequently increased that agreement?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is possible, sir. Things were happening quite fast in the first few days of February, the first week, and I recall somebody telling me they were going to buy some books, 2,000, 5,000, something like that, very vague in my mind as to the specifics involved there.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am trying to refresh your memory. Didn't you learn from Nathan Witt that the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union had agreed to buy 2,000 copies of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. The first knowledge I had of the Mine, Mill Union purchasing copies of my book was from Mr. Kahn, not Nathan Witt.

May I have some water?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. I am sure you may have some water.

Do you know now that Mine, Mill has agreed to buy 6,700 copies of your book and that the Canadian Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers is to buy another 5,000 copies?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was informed about that. I presume that is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what book clubs are to distribute your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you discussed with anyone the distribution of your book by the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. By the Union Shop Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know anything about the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was a member of it once.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know Carl Marzani?

Mr. MATUSOW. I know he is associated with Cameron Associates.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that Carl Marzani is editor of the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Carl Marzani is or was a member of the Communist Party, USA?

Mr. MATUSOW. No knowledge of that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where the Liberty Book Club has its headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where?

Mr. MATUSOW. 100 West 23d Street, New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where is that with relation to the headquarters of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea where the Communist Party headquarters is.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where the Liberty Book Club has its west coast offices?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know where those offices are with respect to the offices of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not the slightest. I don't know where the Communist Party offices are.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you personally, Mr. Matusow, correct any galley proofs for your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you correct any page proofs?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me? Page proofs?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did your publishers suggest any changes on the page proofs?

Mr. MATUSOW. Just editorially, typos, typographical errors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did they suggest any deletions?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anybody else suggest any changes?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall. There might have been one or two. I am inclined to think there might have been one or two in relation to libel law, but I don't recall specifically.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, when you and Mr. Kahn were making tape recordings prior to the time you started dictating your book, did you control the tape recorder?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that tape recorder on all of the time during the session, or did you turn it off and on?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I turned it off and on. Mr. Kahn is all thumbs on electronic devices. I think he would have fouled it up.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the beginning of the recording session, did you leave it on until the session was over?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. It is a very old machine. I have done all the work, and would like to apologize to the committee for the condition of reel No. 1. It was originally a paper tape, and it was affected by some magnetic device. It is therefore in very poor shape. You have a dubbing, but a true copy of it, and that is the best I can do for it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it true that the tape or the wire was turned on for a bit of conversation, then turned off, and then there would be additional conversation and then when you got ready to record, you turned it on again; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That happened any number of times during the daily session?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that the tape does not purport to be in any way a true or complete record of the conversations you and Mr. Kahn had throughout the afternoon?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; that's right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, when did you begin your dictation to the tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. The conversations with Mr. Kahn?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. In the month of November.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure it wasn't about the 16th of November?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very possible, sir. I believe the date is on the tape itself.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you stop?

Mr. MATUSOW. Whatever the date is on tape No. 12.

Mr. SOURWINE. About December 8?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very possible, sir. Yes; I seem to recall in one of the recordings dictating on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you start dictating from the transcriptions of the tape?

Mr. MATUSOW. Throughout the writing, sir. In actuality I don't think I used more than 30 percent of that tape.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when did you finish your dictation of the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have a copy of it, but I believe Mr. Kahn has had a schedule which I worked out. I believe it was the 10th or 11th of January.

Mr. SOURWINE. You dictated your book in not more than 5 weeks?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was about 5 weeks. Might I add, sir, during the days of dictation on the last two tapes I believe I was already dictating to a secretary.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stop for Christmas?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, Christmas Day I didn't work, and Christmas Eve, that day I didn't work. I think I took 2 or 3 days off then, the whole weekend.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the designing of the jacket of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. The dust cover?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, Mr. Kahn showed me the thing, the jacket, and asked me if I approved of it. Only in respect that I furnished Mr. Kahn with a photograph which was used on the dust jacket.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who wrote the blurb for the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. What are you referring to, sir, if I may?

Mr. SOURWINE. The self-description of the book inside the dust cover.

Mr. MATUSOW. This?

Mr. SOURWINE. I don't know about "this." You have there the paper-bound edition. There is a hard-back edition.

Mr. MATUSOW. This would be on the inside flyleaf. This would be the same.

Senator WELKER. May I interrupt counsel for a moment. I want to ask you for the last time—

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry, sir, I didn't hear you.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask you for the last time, so it will be clear for the record, when you received any money from the FBI, the Department of Justice—

Mr. MATUSOW. That's another story, sir.

Senator WELKER. For being a so-called stool pigeon, as you call it.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. Previously you asked me the last time I received money from the FBI, and I said my recollection was 1950. The last time I received money from the Department of Justice I believe was in June of 1954, from the Internal Security section of the Department of Justice. I believe I picked up a check here in Washington at the United States marshal's office.

Senator WELKER. You are speaking now about the section down in Justice, not our Internal Security?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, the section of Justice. That is, to the best of my recollection.

Senator WELKER. I see. How much was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I believe it was 4 or 5 days as a witness at \$25 a day. That would be maybe a hundred and a quarter, something like that.

Senator WELKER. And is that the last time you can recall?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe they also had a \$9 a day per diem that they forwarded to me, and I received in July for about \$60 or \$50.

Senator WELKER. Now, I want to ask you this: Did you inform the Federal Bureau of Investigation that Mr. and Mrs. Craig Vincent were Communists in connection with your reports from San Cristobal Valley Ranch in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you referring to reports I made in the year 1950?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I would have to see those reports. Frankly, I don't think I did in those reports.

Senator WELKER. You don't think. Now, will you answer me yes or no on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only way I can say, sir, I don't recall.

Senator WELKER. Certainly you wouldn't make an accusation without knowing whether it was true or false.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I don't know if I made that accusation in 1950.

Senator WELKER. You don't want to say whether you did or whether you did not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I would be lying to you if I said I knew yes or no. You want the truth, sir.

Senator WELKER. All right. Did you also say then that Henry Collins, Jr., was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea, sir. I would very much like to see those reports. They have since been offered in evidence in Judge Dimock's court, and I presume that the committee can get those reports, and if I were able to look at them, I would know definitely whether I did or didn't.

Senator WELKER. No doubt you would.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you testified that you knew nothing of any Communist activity at the San Cristobal Valley ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said—I don't recall what I said specifically, but in substance I believe I said to this committee that I did not know specifically of Communist Party activities at the ranch.

Senator WELKER. Once again, you can't answer that one "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not active—I was a member of the Communist Party, but I was not an active Communist when I was at that ranch, and I did not take part in Communist activities.

Senator WELKER. You want to leave it with the committee that you cannot say whether or not—you knew nothing of any Communist activities at the San Cristobal Valley ranch, notwithstanding the fact you were a Communist at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know of any Communist activities there, sir, nothing specific.

Senator WELKER. Didn't make any inquiry whatsoever?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. Pardon me, I think I once made an inquiry with somebody, but who was not connected with the ranch. He just happened to be there, and I can't remember his name now, but he was the State leader of the Communist Party in New Mexico.

Senator WELKER. State leader of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was the organizer for the State of New Mexico, it happened to be I think I saw him in Taos or at the ranch, I don't remember now, sir, and I think I said to him, "I am a member of the Communist Party, I'd like to transfer out to New Mexico," but he had no official connection with the ranch and no connection at all.

Senator WELKER. Is he the only person there that you knew to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. The only person I made an inquiry with, and the only person who I ever knew specifically was a member of the Communist Party, and even I didn't know of my own knowledge, but an FBI agent who I was in contact with in Santa Fe told me this fellow was a Communist.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the only person you knew specifically to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. That I can recall now, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "specifically"? Explain that to me.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, on the basis of surmise, as the committee has asked me before, do I know of my own knowledge. Well, I knew

of my own knowledge is what I am trying to say now, sir, and specifically or of my own knowledge I did not know that I can recall now.

The CHAIRMAN. "Specifically," does that mean you suspected others of being Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; just as I now suspect Miss Bentley told lies, the same type of suspect.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever hear Communists give a lecture at that ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I recall.

Senator WELKER. Not that you recall. Did you ever hear any Communist matters discussed at the San Cristobal Ranch in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is an ambiguous statement, sir, Communist matters. There are a lot of things.

Senator WELKER. I will make it as ambiguous as you want to make it. Did you ever hear it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what you mean, sir. You are putting out a broad statement.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever hear Communist matters discussed there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Communist Party matters?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; only in relation to a discussion I had with this fellow who was State organizer of New Mexico Communist Party.

Senator WELKER. That is the only one?

Mr. MATUSOW. An inquiry I had given him, and he was very evasive in the answer, and that was the extent of specific Communist Party matters.

Senator WELKER. Didn't you identify yourself to him as a fellow Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said, "I'm a member of the Communist Party and I know you are the State organizer." He didn't admit it, though. The only way I knew it was because an FBI agent had told me he was.

Senator WELKER. I see. In other words, he didn't take your bait. He was evasive, is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; he was.

Senator WELKER. Now, did you ever see any Communist literature there at this ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I saw literature that I had seen at Communist Party headquarters; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell us what you saw?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I believe some books, I forgot the titles of them, that had been published by international publishers. There were a lot of books there though, a lot of publishers.

Senator WELKER. You don't remember the names or anything of that nature?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not offhand, sir; no.

Senator WELKER. I think that is all I have now, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you have anything to do with the distribution of advance copies of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe only 1 or 2 copies, 1 I gave my parents. No, in fact, I didn't give it to them, not the mimeographed or galleys.

I think that is what you are talking about, sir. If we take it in stages—

Mr. SOURWINE. Advance copies of your book. You have already testified, I believe, that you had nothing to do with the distribution of advance mimeographed copies?

Mr. MATUSOW. That's right, and only in relation to a few friends who this weekend I gave a copy to; my parents and 2 or 3 people.

Mr. SOURWINE. You prepared no list of persons that was to get them?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the distribution of advance page proofs or galleys?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I suggested, and told, not only suggested but told Mr. Kahn, I wanted a copy sent to Jack Anderson here in Washington, and I can't think of anybody else who I specifically wanted to receive a copy of the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Anderson had already been sent one of the copies of the mimeographed texts?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I was talking about, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what you are talking about. I had asked you about page proofs or galleys.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think I picked up a copy of the galleys and gave them to a proprietor of a bookshop in New York who I knew was interested in the book. He wanted to see if he wanted to sell the book or not, and there might have been a copy or two. I am trying to think. Well, the copy I gave the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you remember testifying about your bicycle breaking down?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. It broke down several times, if I remember your testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, one bicycle broke down twice and the other one broke down once. There were two bicycles.

Mr. SOURWINE. They didn't break down completely until just before you got to—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, it was up in Cimarron Canyon it broke down.

Mr. SOURWINE. And it did then break down completely?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. What part broke?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, there were some bearings that needed greasing or the pedal, the sprocket wouldn't go right. I rehabilitated the bike. It was in good shape when I left Taos.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did it break down to the point where you couldn't ride it at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it broke down between Raton and Cimarron. I had to hitchhike to get in there.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you have to do to rehabilitate that bicycle?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I cleaned out the dust and the grime that was in the bearings, and the sprocket and put a little grease in there, and got it working, worked it in a bit, and replaced a couple of bearings that had been missing.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did that the morning after I got in Taos.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was the same morning you were going around Taos meeting various old friends and talking with them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yeah.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were pretty busy that morning, weren't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was relaxing. I don't know how busy I was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you have stated that you had planned to prospect for uranium.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, 2 other fellows, 2 radio announcers down in Dallas and myself, had decided we'd go up to Utah and maybe into Nevada and do some prospecting, 2 of us working in the field and 1 working in the radio station.

Mr. SOURWINE. They were radio announcers in Dallas?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yeah, excuse me, one was a radio announcer and—well, both of them had been radio announcers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you name them, please?

Mr. MATUSOW. You've got me now, sir. I can't for the life of me think of their names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you see them after you left Dallas?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I had given them an address where I thought I would be able to be contacted when they got to Salt Lake.

Mr. SOURWINE. When were you last in Taos?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I don't remember the exact date, but the date that I left to come to New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. October of 1954, you mean?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was October 20, 21, something like that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before that, when was the last time you were in Taos?

Mr. MATUSOW. September of 1953.

Mr. SOURWINE. And before that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1950—1951; pardon me, January—February 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you there in 1950, also?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it true that in 1950 and in 1951 and 1953, when you were in Taos you visited the San Cristobal Valley Ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; only in 1950.

Mr. SOURWINE. Only in 1950?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall going there in 1951.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not go there in 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nor in 1954.

Mr. SOURWINE. Nor in 1954. Have you testified that while you were en route from Dallas to Taos you called up a friend in Salt Lake City?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall saying I might have called a friend in Salt Lake City. I know I called him from Dallas but whether I called him en route, I don't—

Mr. SOURWINE. You named that friend?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Cardall.

Mr. SOURWINE. First name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Richard.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you meet him?

Mr. MATUSOW. In Utah. I met him here in Washington when he was working in this office building.

Mr. SOURWINE. How do you know him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Fairly well.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did you call him about when you telephoned him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I talked to him about theological matters which I hold privileged. I also asked him about how the television and radio work was, chances of getting work in Salt Lake, and I asked him about the situation in relation to prospecting.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is Mr. Cardall an official of any church?

Mr. MATUSOW. He is a member of a church. I believe he holds a priesthood in the church and therefore I discussed matters with him.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say he holds a priesthood?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean in the sense that every male member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints holds a priesthood?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so. Every male member can hold a priesthood, but not every one—

Mr. SOURWINE. You claim the privilege on that basis in regard to your conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think my conversation with him in relation to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is a question which I will claim a privilege on, which has no bearing. Well, it is a privileged conversation and what happened there in such conversation is something I will not discuss.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you consulting him as a spiritual adviser?

Mr. MATUSOW. I won't discuss any question of any conversation in relation to theology with Mr. Cardall or any other member of the church.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are claiming the privilege?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. In that sense; yes, it was in that sense.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did consult him as a spiritual adviser?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that sense, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, have you denied here before this committee that you are an expert on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have said I professed to be one at one time, and I am not an expert in that sense. Yes, sir, I denied it.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you have stated that you have read all or parts of several hundred books on communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. Several hundred theoretical books; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were a member of the Communist Party for 4 years?

Mr. MATUSOW. Approximately 4; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were a trusted Communist and you were permitted to operate a switchboard in Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; Communist Party county headquarters. Let's bring it down to its proper level.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, were you ever charged with stealing books?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. From the Jefferson School & Book Shop and the Worker's Book Shop?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know from where I had been accused of stealing it, but probably from those bookshops.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who made the charge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest—I think a Mr. Bordofsky, who was later expelled from the Communist Party for stealing books.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was the charge true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge ever made in open court by a Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know that was done?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would say it might have been. I don't recall it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with pilfering from a taxi company which employed you in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who made the charge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. It might have been Mr. McTernan.

Senator WELKER. Who?

Mr. MATUSOW. John T. McTernan, of Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. How much were you charged with stealing?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know. Nobody ever gave me a figure. I don't have the slightest idea about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with having been caught by the Worker's Book Shop ringing up a \$5.20 sale as 20 cents?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have been charged with that in court, but the charge is not true.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were charged with that by Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. Probably.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with irregularities in securing subscriptions for the Daily Worker?

Mr. MATUSOW. Many times.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that charge made by Mary Kaufman?

Mr. MATUSOW. By Mary Kaufman I believe, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it true?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you ever charged with a shortage in your accounts in connection with the sale of subscriptions for the Young Republicans in Dayton, Ohio?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know that such a charge has been made against you?

Mr. MATUSOW. It's news to me. When was the charge made? I would like to know a little bit about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. We were concerned mainly with your knowledge of it at the moment, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I am curious about it. You are making the charge. Somebody made a charge. I would like to know about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question I am leading up to is this. You had a great many charges made against you which you deny as false, which were made by Mary Kaufman who was then and is now an attorney for the Communist Party or Communists.

I want to ask you in the face of the fact that she made false charges against you in open court, how did it happen that you have subsequently cooperated with her in the giving of affidavits?

Mr. MATUSOW. I stated before, sir, and I will state again, I gave false testimony in a court of law. People were convicted, I believe, on my testimony, or some were. If those people were convicted on the basis of my false testimony, then they ought to have a new trial. I don't care if the Government puts me in jail and throws the key away.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you learn anything while you were in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I learn something every day I live, whether it is in the Communist Party or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did the Communist Party teach you anything?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not tangibly; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you learn some of the things that the Communist Party was teaching?

Mr. MATUSOW. I went to Communist Party schools. I doubt if I learned very much.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, what did the Communist Party teach about how to treat defectors from the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. Oh, probably I think it says to call them a Trotskyite, don't talk to them, ostracize them from your life, et cetera, just leave them alone, ignore them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Call them liars, call them stool pigeons?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, stool pigeon, informer, rat, scab, a lot of names.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, what did the Communist Party teach about how to act on the witness stand?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never learned anything. The only knowledge I have about what I am to do on the witness stand I have learned from Government attorneys and the congressional committee investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute now, sir. He asked you what the Communist Party taught about how to act on the witness stand. If they taught you anything—

Mr. MATUSOW. They taught me nothing. All my knowledge was learned from Government attorneys.

Senator WELKER. May I ask one question, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Matusow, have you ever gone under an assumed name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I have had many aliases, sir, many.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you mind relating them to us?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might miss a few, but I did it the other day. I will do it again. Harvey Matt, which I used while in the Communist Party; Ralph Page, which I used while I was an investigator for the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission; Howard Markow, also used while an investigator for the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission; Harvey Marshall, which is not an assumed name but my first and second names, which I have used in show business for a number of years.

Senator WELKER. Did you say Howard Markow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I once used the name Howard Markow.

Senator WELKER. I believe, if I didn't misread your book, in your book I think you said it was Harvey Markow. Am I wrong on that?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might be a typo. I think you read it wrong, sir, or it's a typographical error. I believe you will find it in the chapter "Dayton Women for Peace."

**Senator WELKER** (reading) :

I assumed the name of **Howard Markow**.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Yes, sir; that is what I thought it said.

**Senator WELKER** (reading) :

have just come from the Southwest.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Right, sir.

**Senator WELKER**. Very well. Any other name?

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Well, I had a nickname when I was a child, Kid Nickles, and younger in that period some of my friends used to call me Blackie, but other than that, I don't recall any other names.

**Senator WELKER**. Weren't you taking an awful chance, Mr. Matsu—

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Matusow. I am not an island in the Straits of Formosa, sir.

**Senator WELKER**. I had that on my mind, too.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Yes, sir; I realize that.

**Senator WELKER**. I am very sorry for that.

Aren't you taking an awful chance at these meetings, using an assumed name? One of your fellow Commie members could have walked in, and you were in trouble.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. It happened to me at a meeting out in Ohio, somebody recognized me and two people came over to me and very politely said, "We would appreciate it if you would leave and don't come back." I walked out the door and nobody laid a hand on me, and that was it, and after that I didn't feel I was taking much of a chance, because they only asked me to leave.

**Senator WELKER**. Is that where the women had the peace—

**Mr. MATUSOW**. No, that was another meeting.

**Senator WELKER**. That is all I have.

**The CHAIRMAN**. Mr. Matusow, this committee is going to call Miss Bentley as a witness. I want you to dictate to the stenographer in full your charges against her veracity.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. All right, sir. I hope this committee calls Mr. Roy Cohn, too.

**The CHAIRMAN**. Wait just a minute. That is a decision the committee will make.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. All right, sir.

**The CHAIRMAN**. You may proceed, sir.

**Mr. MATUSOW**. I believe that Miss Bentley has under oath told falsehoods against people. I believe this because on at least one occasion, and now I recall a second occasion meeting with Miss Bentley, and Miss Bentley—

**The CHAIRMAN**. Let me see if we have got it all. It was your testimony about a dinner engagement. Is that the full knowledge that you have about her swearing falsely, where she told you so?

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Yes, sir.

**The CHAIRMAN**. That is your full knowledge?

**Mr. MATUSOW**. Where she told me—

**The CHAIRMAN**. Is there anything that you know that is not in this record about her testifying falsely?

**Mr. MATUSOW**. I believe I stated, sir, that the galley proofs and the manuscript of her book would bear out some of my accusations.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, no, sir, I believe what is in the record at this point is the extent of my knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the extent of your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Now, you have brought certain charges—

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir, please. I would like to consult with counsel on something.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, might I request the committee that copies of Miss Bentley's testimony, if they could be furnished me, I might read them and might come up with something out of my own knowledge, if the committee is interested. I would be glad to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter that will be taken under advisement.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you have brought certain charges against the witness named Paul Crouch.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to know if those charges are confined to certain alleged discrepancies in his testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. They are confined to those alleged discrepancies and, sir, my personal relations and contact with Mr. Crouch over a period of 2 or 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that in the record?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Your relationship with Mr. Crouch?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Federation of Former Communists, and I will endeavor to locate any further correspondence and furnish the committee with that material.

The CHAIRMAN. What I want to be certain of is this: that the full knowledge, the full information that you have about Mr. Crouch's testimony is in the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Proceed, Mr. Sourwine.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment.

Mr. Witness, did you ever say in your book that Whittaker Chambers testified falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall if I put it that bluntly in the book. I might have said, I believe—I don't think I said it that way. I believe I can find what I said about Mr. Chambers, if I may.

Senator WELKER. I wish you would. I thought I had it here, but I couldn't—

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any knowledge about Mr. Chambers?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I never met Mr. Chambers. I will find the exact quote where I refer to him. I will check the index here. I have an opinion about Mr. Chambers, but that is just an opinion. I said here—may I quote, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. On page 67, to get the full context of the meaning of what I said about Mr. Chambers, last paragraph on page 67:

Clements' statement about Lindbergh's crossing the Atlantic stuck in my mind. There were many ex-Communists who had crossed their Atlantic. And not too many of them could find the gimmick needed to make the headlines. There was Matt Cvetic's gimmick, "I was a Communist for the FBI;" Herbert Philbrick's family gimmick, "I led three lives;" Elizabeth Bentley, "the spy queen;" Paul Crouch, "of the Armed Forces;" Whittaker Chambers and his "pumpkin papers;" Louis Budenz and his theological approach.

There was little left for Harvey Matusow. The more I thought of this, the more determined I became to make youth my gimmick.

Senator WELKER. Your gimmick then was youth?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. To match these other people. And you didn't infer with respect to Whittaker Chambers, Mr. Budenz, that they had committed perjury at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I didn't believe I spelled it out in detail, sir. There are many unwritten chapters to this book. Time didn't allow the writing of them.

Senator WELKER. Do you know any acts, any statements under oath given by Herbert Philbrick?

Mr. MATUSOW. No.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment. Paul Crouch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Can we take them one at a time, sir?

Senator WELKER. Or anyone else, given before congressional committees, courts of law, or grand juries, which were perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. Taking them one at a time, I am not accusing Mr. Philbrick of anything. My personal opinion is Mr. Philbrick never knew anything about the Communist Party in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not interested in that.

Mr. MATUSOW. You asked me, sir. I know nothing about Mr. Philbrick. As I say, his knowledge of Communists was very limited up in Boston. He never had a chance to know anything, if anything existed. As far as Matt Cvetic is concerned, I wouldn't trust him with a 10-foot pole.

Senator WELKER. I am sure Mr. Cvetic would trust you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I realize that, but his radio show, he himself has admitted to me, and I state in the book, is full of lies purported to be truth.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell us one now?

Now you have made an accusation under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. In the picture, for instance, "I was a Communist for the FBI," which was purported to be truthful about Mr. Cvetic, there is an incident about his having a gun duel with Communist Party members in a railway tunnel. That never happened. Mr. Cvetic told me it never happened.

Senator WELKER. He told you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And in whose presence did he tell you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. Anyone else present?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. Would you say—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall who else was present. I don't recall who else was present.

Senator WELKER. On such an important matter?

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, I was playing the same game he was at the time, sir. It wasn't that important.

Senator WELKER. You swore this fellow had a gimmick and you so stated in your book.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir, I knew that the radio show that he had and the motion picture were full of holes and was phony.

Senator WELKER. All right, you stated a moment ago that he stated a falsehood.

Mr. MATUSOW. He told me he never had any gun battle in a tunnel in Pittsburgh with any Communist agents. I talked to him about the possibility of my writing some scripts, fictionalized stories of the Communist Party, which he would try and get used on his radio show, and if I were going to write the scripts as fiction, and he said, "I will try to get them used," certainly it wasn't a story of his experience in the Communist Party which he and the people who produced his show tried to make the American public believe were true facts.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, in closing you omit to mention Mary Markward.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know nothing about Mary Markward, nothing about the woman.

Senator WELKER. A very famous undercover agent for the FBI.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know nothing about Mary Markward other than what I have read in the papers, and I don't want to base it on surmise.

Senator WELKER. I thought you were quite an expert on Communists and undercover agents.

Mr. MATUSOW. I never said I was an expert.

Senator WELKER. I think you have missed one of the greatest.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have heard the name but I am not going around blatantly taking names out of the air and throwing them at people. I have met Mr. Crouch, Budenz, Cvetic, and Miss Bentley.

Senator WELKER. And like the chairman suggested a moment ago, if you would just name under oath those overt acts of perjury that they committed, we would appreciate it very much.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know the overt acts. They are very clever at committing that perjury, just as I had been clever at telling falsehoods.

Senator WELKER. Yes, sir, indeed you are right on that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, we had good training.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, I will finish your book tonight. I haven't had a chance to finish it all. Hasn't it been your ambition to write a book since you came into this business of an informer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, sir, I have wanted to write for a long time, and I continue to write.

Senator WELKER. You wanted to write a book for what purpose?

Mr. MATUSOW. This book?

Senator WELKER. To make money or to aid the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. This book was not written for a money book purpose, money motive. I have had many money motives in my life, and I still do in relation to other work.

When I write a TV script, I do it for a money motive. When I write comedy material for anybody on network TV, if I can sell it, that is done for a money motive.

Senator WELKER. Have you done pretty well at that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have sold some stuff, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't want to leave this committee with the impression that you are quite a TV writer?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I am a novice at writing. I am quite new at the game, but I can write.

Senator WELKER. I wouldn't doubt that at all, if you can write like you can talk, you can.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the way I write.

Senator WELKER. That is all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you not know this committee was attempting to serve you with a subpoena before we served you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe a half hour or so prior to the service of the subpoena that the committee's investigator, Frank Schroeder, was at the office of Cameron & Kahn, a phone call was made to the Chelsea Hotel of Rockaway, informing me of that fact, and I waited for the subpoena server.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not know it earlier than that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you dodging the subpoena service?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you stay at your home on Wednesday night before you were served with the subpoena?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I might have stayed at the hotel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you stay Thursday night?

Mr. MATUSOW. Thursday of what week, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with the subpoena.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have the slightest—wait a minute, now was that in January? I would like to have the date because at one time I was out of the city.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the night that you stayed in a motel in Westchester County?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I am getting at, sir. Yes, I do very definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. Name it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea. It was a "lulu," though, an Arabic name, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you register under your own name?

Mr. MATUSOW. I wanted to get away from the press and anybody else, so I could complete work on the galleys of the book.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Herb Tank.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with the subpoena, you were at that motel, weren't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I believe the dates were wrong. Trace it datewise.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Thursday night before you were served with that subpoena, you were at Mr. Kahn's house?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I don't think so, sir. Let's get the date, the day and the month, because a lot of weeks have flipped by; I mean, seem to have gone by pretty quickly, and I have been a lot of places in the last few weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the occasion on which you—  
Mr. MATUSOW. This committee served me with three subpoenas, don't forget, so we have to establish which one.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember, Mr. Matusow, the occasion where you slept at a motel after having registered under an assumed name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yup; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you done that more than once?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not in a motel. Twice in a hotel.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you there in a motel in Westchester County?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, the night before you were at that motel, where did you sleep?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the Hotel Ossining, in Ossining, N. Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the night after?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was a Sunday night—Saturday night. Sunday night, in the motel. To be specific, Sunday night, checked in the 30th of January, and left on Monday morning, the 31st, at about 7 in the morning, or 6:30. The evening of the 29th, which I believe was a Saturday, was spent at the Hotel Ossining, in Ossining, N. Y. The evening of the 28th, which was a Friday, and the evening of the 27th, which is a Thursday, was spent at the Hotel Alexander Hamilton in Paterson, N. J.; prior to that at the Chelsea Hotel, 222 West 23d Street, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you spend any of those evenings at the home of Mr. Kahn in Croton-on-Hudson?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had dinner there on Sunday, the 30th, but I didn't spend the evening there.

Mr. SOURWINE. You didn't, on any of those dates you had testified about, spend the whole night at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not on that Thursday, Friday, Saturday, or Sunday.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is your testimony under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you last spend the night at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea—Excuse me; I think it was the night after I got served the subpoena.

Let's see: my recollection is it might have been the 5th of February, but I am not sure. I was served the subpoena for the grand jury on the 3d of February, or the 2d, Wednesday the 2d. On Thursday the 3d, I had a press conference. Friday the 4th, I believe I was in New York, and left at about 11 o'clock that night, or 10 o'clock; went to Croton with Mr. Kahn Friday the 4th, and I believe I stayed there the 5th and the 6th, Saturday and Sunday.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is Friday the 4th, you are testifying you left New York with Mr. Kahn, about 11 o'clock at night?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been 9 o'clock, I forgot.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 8 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. It could have even been 7.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 6 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Might it have been 5 o'clock?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Weren't you, as a matter of fact, in Croton-on-Hudson before 8 o'clock that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe so.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your best recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. My best recollection is I have been to Croton-on-Hudson on a number of occasions in recent weeks.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you let me ask the question?

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir; go ahead.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified you went to Croton-on-Hudson with Mr. Kahn on a particular evening, to wit, this Friday. What is your best recollection as to when you got there, what time of the evening?

Mr. MATUSOW. My best recollection is that I arrived at about 10 in the evening.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, is there anything—

Mr. MATUSOW. Caught an 8:25 train, I think.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there anything that went on that evening that fixes the date in your memory?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I just seem to recall spending the weekend there; that's all—that weekend.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Kahn was with you in New York and went with you to Croton-on-Hudson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was there a meeting at Mr. Kahn's home that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are sure about that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember any meeting at Mr. Kahn's home.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever attend a meeting of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade at Mr. Kahn's home?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. May we pause, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

We will take a recess until 10 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 1, 1955.)

×





# STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

## (THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MATUSOW CASE)

---

---

### HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY  
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

*Congress.* *Senate.* COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PURSUANT TO

**S. Res. 58**

---

MARCH 1, 1955

---

**PART 4**

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1955

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi  
ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee  
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
PRICE DANIEL, Texas  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin  
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota  
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah  
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois  
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho  
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina  
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas  
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri  
PRICE DANIEL, Texas

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah  
HERMAN WELKER, Idaho  
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

J. G. SOURWINE, *Chief Counsel*  
RICHARD ARENS and ALVA C. CARPENTER, *Associate Counsels*  
BENJAMIN N. MANDEL, *Director of Research*

# STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

---

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1955

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT  
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess at 10 a. m. in room 457, Senate Office Building, Senator Price Daniel, presiding.

Present: Senators Eastland (chairman of the subcommittee), Daniel, McClellan, and Welker.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Alva C. Carpenter, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; and Robert C. McManus, professional staff member.

Senator DANIEL. The committee will come to order. All right, Mr. Matusow, as acting chairman of the committee this morning, I would like to caution you to make your answers as responsive as possible to the questions. Yesterday on many occasions you will remember that you included testimony concerning other people about whom you were not asked and made statements which you, yourself, upon reflection, conceded were based upon hearsay and left the wrong impression with the committee, and I believe on one or two occasions you said that you wished that such impression, such statements could be withdrawn from the committee record, and so I simply caution you on that this morning so that we may prevent such occurrence today.

## TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW (RESUMED), ACCCOMPANIED BY HIS ATTORNEY, STANLEY FAULKNER

Mr. MATUSOW. I will endeavor to be responsive, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Thank you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Brevity will be my position.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, a couple of loose ends from yesterday: You spoke yesterday about your night club experience. Would you tell us how you billed yourself when you made night club appearances?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall just how the billing went. Sometimes it was Harvey Marshall, nothing more than that, and another name I used in a night club was Dimitri and that was for a special show, working on something else away from my regular pattern.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you characterize yourself in your night club billings?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I do not recall just how the billing went. It depended upon where I appeared. In Juarez, Mexico, I had one type of billing; in Washington, D. C., I think mostly the satirization of the Army-McCarthy hearings, and in New York on some occasions it was the same, and on others it just had a bit of, well, some sophistication with humor.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you bill yourself as actor and comedian?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, that is a listing in Players Guide. That is completely different because in that I also endeavored to get certain straight dramatic roles on television.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, sir, getting back to the question we were discussing just before we adjourned last night, I had asked you earlier about whether you had known we were attempting to serve with a subpoena before we served you and about whether you were dodging service and you had stated you were not, and I was then attempting to make the record clear on where you were just before you were served. You were served on Friday, the 4th of February.

Mr. MATUSOW. Just a moment, sir. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, did you stay at your home, at your apartment on Wednesday night, the second?

Mr. MATUSOW. If you will just give me a moment and I'll go back to the week and try and retrace all the steps.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes; would you do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you. (The witness consulted with counsel.)

I think it would save time if you would like me to recount where I was on the days starting on Tuesday, January 25, this going through Friday, the 4th of February.

Mr. SOURWINE. Fine.

Mr. MATUSOW. On Tuesday, January 25, I was in New York and stayed that evening as I recall at the Hotel Chelsea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that at the room the Hotel Chelsea rented by Mr. Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Mr. Tank with you there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe he was on jury duty then. I don't believe he was with me.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you alone in the room that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall being so. He might have been with me that night or might not have been. The recollection is not too clear. On Wednesday night, January 26—a correction in the record. I believe Mr. Tank was not on jury duty that week; my mistake. He was excused for that week and went back on the next week.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Do you know of your own knowledge why he was excused from jury duty that week?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I believe he brought a letter in from the publishers, Cameron & Kahn. That week the question—I was doing the final editing of my book and I believe Mr. Tank was available for certain work getting the book out to the printers to get galleys made and he had a car.

Senator WELKER. A letter from Cameron & Kahn?

Mr. MATUSOW. Showing that he was employed.

Senator WELKER. Showing that he was employed, in your opinion, was the reason why he was excused from jury duty?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm not familiar with it. I wasn't there, sir. I know he was excused for that week and returned to jury duty the following week.

Senator WELKER. That's all.

Mr. MATUSOW. On Wednesday, January 26, I was also in New York and I recall Mr. Tank did spend the night at the Hotel Chelsea as did I. Thursday morning at about 6 o'clock, 6 a. m., that is, Mr. Tank and myself left New York City—it might have been 7. We went to Paterson, N. J., and checked into the Hotel Alexander Hamilton. I might be wrong on the time, but I know we got to the hotel early in the morning. We stayed at the hotel in Paterson. On Friday, January 28—that is the Hotel Alexander Hamilton in Paterson, N. J., where we registered under aliases or assumed names. On Friday the 28th of January, we also stayed at the Hotel Alexander Hamilton, left the hotel for a few hours in order to pick up galley proofs of the book at the printers.

Mr. SOURWINE. You missed Thursday. What did you do Thursday?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said that was the day we went to the Hotel Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stayed there that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, and we stayed there Friday night, leaving the hotel in order to pick up galley proofs of the book. I was working on the editing of the galley proofs and that was the reason for the trip out of town, to be near the printers. On that Friday, as I recall, the first affidavit that I signed was filed, the one in El Paso, Tex. That was also a reason for my not being in New York. I wanted to avoid any contact with the press, who I thought would be trying to locate me at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you saying it was the press you were dodging and not this committee's subpoena?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was the press I was dodging, sir.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman. May I have the date of this Friday that you are referring to now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. The 28th of January.

Senator WELKER. The 28th of January. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. This year.

Mr. SOURWINE. I was trying to get the—

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm almost up to it, sir; just a few days to go if you would like it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Mr. MATUSOW. On Saturday the 29th of January Mr. Tank and I left Paterson, N. J., and went to Ossining, N. Y., stayed at the Hotel Ossining which is nearby Croton and Mr. Kahn's home.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you register under aliases there, also?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; we did.

And on Sunday—

Senator WELKER. What names did you give, please, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me, sir.

Senator WELKER. What names did you give?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall the names, sir.

Senator WELKER. You do not recall the names?

Mr. MATUSOW. Some names I picked out of thin air.

Senator WELKER. You are sure of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You can't recall fictitious names that you and your companion used in registering there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Haven't the slightest idea.

Senator WELKER. Haven't the slightest idea?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall on one occasion I used a British name. I was dressed in tweeds and had a handlebar moustache. I had shaved my moustache that weekend.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, that is very interesting. I am sure the committee would like to hear how you were dressed.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I'm just saying I used a name like Richards or something. I do not recall the name. The next night I registered I think I used an Armenian name.

Senator WELKER. An Armenian name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and it might have been a Rumanian, something like Jorjeseu or some name which I felt went with the moustache which was quite large.

Senator WELKER. I see. Now tell us about this moustache. That is very interesting. Can you describe it as best you can. You are an actor and I assume that you are familiar with putting on makeup?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, it wasn't a makeup moustache. I had let the thing grow for almost 2 months.

Senator WELKER. All right, it was a handlebar moustache you said?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Like we have in the wild West?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; in fact, I had a beard up until about 2 weeks prior to that which was just as long.

Senator WELKER. When did you start wearing this beard and this handlebar moustache?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I've worn one on and off now. I grew one when I was in the Army. This one in particular I started growing or I should say I stopped shaving in November 1954, the first week in November, that is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Was there any reason why you started growing this moustache?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very good reason, sir.

Senator WELKER. Why?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was planning to do a children's show.

Senator WELKER. Children's show?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Santa Claus?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. It had nothing to do with your writing a certain book called *False Witness*?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, no, sir; in fact, some pictures were taken by a commercial photographer with me. The show was planned to be done with a live crow and I was supposed to be Dimitri, the pirate who takes children on adventures without violence.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Now why didn't you shave off this handlebar moustache and your beard when you were so alarmed about the press seeing you and counsel at least infers you were a little bit alarmed about the subpoena?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I wasn't alarmed about any subpoena. In fact, I stated prior to service that I welcomed any investigation.

Senator WELKER. Very well, but you were doing a good deal of sidestepping in going around the country. It was rather hard to locate you, you will admit that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not believe so. I believe, when I was informed that the committee wanted to serve me with the subpoena I said I'm here and I'm waiting, and I ordered a cup of coffee for the committee investigator. Mr. Schroeder came in, had coffee and relaxed.

Senator WELKER. When was it you discarded the handlebar moustache and your makeup?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it was either Saturday the 29th—it wasn't makeup, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, I am telling you it was makeup whether it is natural or fictitious.

Mr. MATUSOW. It was very natural.

Senator WELKER. Very well, I think we have all tried that act.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you shave your handlebar moustache?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe Saturday night the 29th of January but it might have been Sunday the 30th.

Senator WELKER. Very well. Now, counsel, I'm through.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead, Mr. Matusow. You stated where you were on the 29th.

Mr. MATUSOW. I stayed at the Hotel Ossining, Ossining, N. Y.

Mr. SOURWINE. Before we leave Ossining and Paterson, N. J., will you tell us whether you had any business in either one of those towns?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I had no business there. I was just there to have a little quiet away from telephones and people so I could finish the proofreading of the galleys of my book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it quiet at the Hotel Chelsea when you were there?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, there was much business going on and it was not—

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you find it quiet in Paterson when you were there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, yes, it was quiet, serene and I was able to work.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, then, why did you have to move to Ossining?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that Sunday I had an appointment in Croton, N. Y., with Miss Kaufman and Mr. Lewis, the attorneys for the Communist Party leaders.

Mr. SOURWINE. So you were making a trip by easy stages from Paterson to Croton, 1 day at Ossining and the next day at Croton, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. They are only a few miles apart. We looked for a motel in Croton and couldn't find one. The nearest one was at Ossining.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you went back to Ossining?

Mr. MATUSOW. Went to Ossining about an 8- to 10-minute drive to Mr. Kahn's home in Croton.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where did you stay the night of the 30th?

Mr. MATUSOW. At a motel, I forgot the name of it, on the Sawmill River Parkway in New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. Still under an alias?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And the 31st?

Mr. MATUSOW. The 31st I believe I stayed home.

Mr. SOURWINE. At your own apartment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; or I believe stayed at the Hotel Chelsea, I do not recall, but I was living in one or the other. I considered them both home at the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Mr. Tank still with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, he was; but on the 31st he went back to jury duty.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then on the first what did you do that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I stayed home or at the Hotel Chelsea.

Mr. SOURWINE. And on the 2d?

Mr. MATUSOW. The 2d of February was the day I made a few television appearances, newsreel appearances, and on that day I was served a subpoena by the Justice Department to appear before the grand jury; could not avoid service and did not try to skip or evade any issuance of a subpoena; that was on the 2d of February.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was a Wednesday?

Mr. MATUSOW. Wednesday, the 2d. On Thursday the 3d of February, I had a press conference at a hotel in New York and was available to the press and anybody who wanted to serve the subpoena on me, and on Friday, the 4th, I was in the office of my publisher—I'm not trying to hide—and accepted service of a subpoena from this committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were served with a subpoena from the grand jury the first day you came aboveground after this tour with the mustache; weren't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, tour with and without a mustache.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now you haven't told us what you did on Wednesday night, the 2d?

Mr. MATUSOW. Wednesday night, the 2d, I believe I stayed home, but I don't recall. I might have stayed at the Hotel Chelsea or I might have gone up to Mr. Kahn's home and spent the night with Mr. Kahn and his family.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, there are a great many possibilities. We are attempting to determine what you did do.

Mr. MATUSOW. I couldn't specifically say what I did that night, sir. My recollection is that I stayed at home but I could be wrong.

Mr. SOURWINE. By "home" you mean at your apartment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And then on Thursday the 3d where did you stay that night?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I also stayed home that night. I seem to recall that 1 night during that week I went to Croton, that is, after Sunday, either Wednesday or Thursday, and spent the night at Mr. Kahn's home.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrogate a moment on that, if I may.

Senator DANIEL. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Witness, I didn't bring this out yesterday but I believe this is the first time I have ever interrogated you or ever had you on the witness stand since I have been in the Senate or since you have had your activities; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my recollection, that is correct, sir.

Senator WELKER. And to my knowledge yesterday was the first time I have ever seen you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, to your knowledge, but we have met before formally, been introduced, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, I do not recall that.

Mr. MATUSOW. I do, sir.

Senator WELKER. Perhaps you do, I don't. Now, I want to be specific with respect to the dates you were served subpoenas. What were those dates?

Mr. MATUSOW. Grand jury subpoena on Wednesday the 2d of February I was served with a subpoena at the Hotel Dolphin, I believe.

Senator WELKER. That is where you were holding a press conference?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I went up there at the request of American Broadcasting Co. They wanted some television newsreel shots of me prior to the press conference they could make simultaneously with it. That was, I believe, at 4 p. m., Wednesday the 2d of February when I was served with the subpoena.

And I believe it was 1:03 in the afternoon, 1 or 2 p. m. or 11:03, I forget which, that Committee Staff Member Frank Schroeder served me with a subpoena in room 122 of the Hotel Chelsea in New York City on Friday the 4th of February. I was then served with a subpoena, another subpoena from the committee I believe on Monday, the 7th of February, in the grand-jury anteroom in Federal courthouse at Foley Square, New York, and I was then served with another subpoena by this committee sometime while I was on the stand in Judge Dimock's court—I forgot the date of that one but I was served, not in court, legal service in the corridor.

Mr. SOURWINE. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the subpoenas of this committee were on the 4th, on the 8th, and on the 14th.

Senator WELKER. Now, Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir. All right, sir. Thank you.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever been a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you know something about it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And would you tell us what you know about it?

Mr. MATUSOW. A group of veterans of the civil war in Spain in the 1930's.

Senator WELKER. Dedicated to the Communist cause?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have accused them of that but I have no real knowledge of it. I know of a few anti-Communist members of that brigade.

Senator WELKER. You do?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You accused them of it but you have no knowledge of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever attended a meeting of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, with particular reference to the times when you were being subpenned and counsel infers that they were trying to subpenn you and could not locate you, did you meet any member or members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge. I might have met somebody who was a member but I did not know it if I did.

Senator WELKER. Did you attend any meetings of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you say not to your knowledge did you meet any member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I might have met somebody in a bar who was a member of that brigade and wouldn't have known about it. That's what I mean.

Senator WELKER. Did you meet anyone any other place that might have been a member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade other than a bar? I hope that you don't want to leave the committee the inference that you spend quite a bit of time in bars.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I don't even drink, but where I live there is a tavern which is very similar to an English pub where many friends of mine, writers and artists, gather, and we chat about nothing in particular but that is the way intellectual conversations go where I live, Greenwich Village.

Senator WELKER. Well, you know as a matter of fact—

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm a teetotaler.

Senator WELKER. The Abraham Lincoln Brigade has disbanded?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir.

Senator WELKER. Never heard of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. That it disbanded? No knowledge of it.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask you this: Whether it was in a pub, a bar, or any place else during the times mentioned by counsel, did you ever meet or converse with any individual or group of individuals who were members or had been members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. What period of time are you talking about, sir?

Senator WELKER. When counsel interrogated you?

Mr. MATUSOW. You mean about the last few weeks?

Senator WELKER. Yes, indeed, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Senator WELKER. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know the background.

Senator WELKER. Can't you be more specific than that?

Mr. MATUSOW. What I mean by that, sir, is I don't know the background of every individual I meet. As far as I know, I met no member of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade or ex-member of it, but it is at all possible, but I didn't know anybody's background, people who I met.

Senator WELKER. You did not converse with any person or persons that you knew to have been a member of the now disbanded Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. You want that to be a categorical answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. It has to be, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, I'm merely asking you.

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer is that to my knowledge, my knowledge of the people's background who I met, I know of no member of the brigade.

Senator WELKER. Well, do you know of any meetings of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, whether or not the brigade has disbanded, but those who once were members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, do you know of any meeting held in or about New York City at, say, around the 4th day of February 1955?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you heard of any?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you know of any meeting being held on Glenberry Road, Croton-on-the-Hudson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you referring to Mr. Kahn's home?

Senator WELKER. If that is Mr. Kahn's home, why that is what I'm referring to.

Mr. MATUSOW. I want to correct you. It is Glenderry Road:

Senator WELKER. All right, Glenderry Road.

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I did not know of any meetings.

Senator WELKER. Didn't know of any meetings there?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Weren't you informed about any meetings of any sort whether it is the "Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise" or the Abraham Lincoln Brigade?

Mr. MATUSOW. Or the Daughters of the American Revolution, or the Sons of the American Revolution; no sir, I don't know of any.

Senator WELKER. Made no inquiry with respect to that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. That's all.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, during this time that you have been interrogated about by Senator Welker, did you meet with any person known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have seen a few people, didn't meet with any.

Senator DANIEL. Did you talk with any individuals known to you to be members of the Communist Party? I'm talking now about other than your publishers and Mr. Herb Tank whom you have testified you believe to have been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATUSOW. I testified, sir, that I believed at one time he was a member of the Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. Yes; you believe that your publishers and Mr. Tank were members of the Communist Party, but you said you did not know for sure.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And I believe yesterday you said you did not care?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Now in addition to them did you meet or talk with anyone whom you believe to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, while in Judge Dimock's court I believe I said "Hello" to Mr. Sigerson who was a defendant in that trial that I testified at, just "Hello, how are you this morning?"

Senator DANIEL. All right; any others?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe there was a Daily Worker correspondent present. I believe I said "Hello" to him as well as saying "Hello" to the other newspapermen who greeted me.

Senator DANIEL. What was the Daily Worker's correspondent's name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Raymond.

Senator DANIEL. Any other person?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge, who were Communists.

Senator DANIEL. Who was the attorney for the Communist Party you mentioned a minute ago?

Mr. MATUSOW. Didn't mention it. I mentioned a previous defendant in that case, not an attorney, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you not, during your testimony here, this morning, mention someone whom you referred to as attorney for the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, yes, sir, earlier this morning. Yes, the attorney, not for the Communist Party, sir, but for certain defendants who were Communists. I think there is a distinction, sir.

Senator DANIEL. There was an attorney you referred to in your testimony this morning as an attorney for the Communist Party. I wrote that down to ask who that was.

Mr. MATUSOW. But I corrected myself immediately to say for the defendants, Communist defendants, but the attorneys were, I believe it is Robert Lewis, but I'm not sure of the first name, and Miss Mary Kaufman.

Senator DANIEL. Did you talk with anyone else other than your publishers and Mr. Tank, whom you believe to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I think the record says I believed at one time or had believed that they were Communists.

Senator DANIEL. Yes, and I think your testimony here, the first or second day, you said you still believed your publishers and Mr. Tank to be members of the Communist Party. The record will speak for itself. That is my recollection of the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection differs, sir, but I think we can go on.

Senator DANIEL. Now, let us get down to the real truth about the matter—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. As you are willing to call it the truth this morning. Isn't the truth about the matter that you today believe that your publishers, Mr. Angus Cameron and Mr. Kahn are members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir. I don't have any opinion one way or another about it.

Senator DANIEL. Oh, now, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. I call them leftists, pro-Communists.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, look.

Senator DANIEL. Do you want to tell this committee that you have no idea, no opinion in the world as to whether Mr. Kahn and Mr. Cameron are members of the Communist Party? Do you want to tell us that and then say that you are telling the truth today?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I want to tell you I have no opinion about that at this time, yes, sir. You know why?

Senator DANIEL. Well, were you telling us, were you telling this committee a falsehood when you said at the original hearings that you did believe that they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Now, look, sir—

Senator DANIEL. At the date that you testified here at the beginning of this hearing?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, do you want me to sit here and start attacking people who are friends of mine?

Senator DANIEL. No, sir, all I want you to do is to tell the truth and explain to the committee why you changed your testimony now.

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I said I had previously. I once accused Mr. Kahn of being a Communist in testimony at one time. I didn't know he was. I believed he was. I had accused Mr. Cameron, through a publication I worked for, of being a Communist or a Communist-fronter. I believed he was a Communist. In conversation or in a statement to somebody I had accused Mr. Tank of being a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. And I believed he was. And I believed that at the time, I believed so, do you follow me, that they were Communists?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. And that opinion held forth quite recently, but I do not have any opinion one way or another about it because I don't care one way or another. I like them as people and I don't care what their politics are. I think these—

Senator DANIEL. How recently does that opinion hold?

Mr. MATUSOW. That opinion held until I got to know them as individuals.

Senator DANIEL. Now then you told this committee previously, you have told this committee that neither of the three men, either Mr. Kahn, Mr. Cameron, or Mr. Tank, had denied that they were members of the Communist Party when you accused them of that; didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had read about no denial. I never accused them face to face about it.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you, or other members of this committee did, as to whether or not either of the three men had denied that they were members of the Communist Party when you were accusing them of being members and you said no, that they had not.

Mr. MATUSOW. To my knowledge they had not.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you have accused them of being members of the Communist Party to their face, have you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You have never discussed it with them since you have been in their company here recently?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Never discussed it at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; there are more beautiful things in the world to discuss than Communist Party membership or not Communist Party membership.

Senator DANIEL. And you hate the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't hate anything, sir, I don't think it is Christian to hate.

Senator DANIEL. You don't think that the Communist Party is a danger to the United States Government?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think any ism alien to our Constitution is a danger, including communism.

Senator DANIEL. I'm asking you about the Communist Party, Mr. Matusow, and I asked you at the beginning this morning to make your answers responsive.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you think the Communist Party is a danger and a threat to the United States Government?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe they are certainly dangerous but not nearly as dangerous as certain activities of congressional committees.

Senator DANIEL. Will you answer the question yes or no? It calls for a yes-or-no answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir, do I believe the Communist Party of the United States a danger to the United States Government?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Frankly, no.

Senator DANIEL. You do not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you change your opinion with respect to that?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I saw how certain other groups work in trying to destroy our Constitution. I think the real danger lies with the people—

Senator WELKER. More particularly you changed your opinion after you received a contract from Cameron & Kahn, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, sir, that is a ridiculous attitude to take. It is hilarious.

Senator WELKER. Is it so ridiculous?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir: of course it is.

Senator WELKER. All right, then, I want to ask you this, going back to my home State: Yesterday you named a publisher, Mr. Gipson.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Gipson.

Senator WELKER. Caxton Printers?

Mr. MATUSOW. Caxton Printers, Ltd., in Caldwell, Idaho.

Senator WELKER. I know him very well. He is a fine American.

Mr. MATUSOW. He is that, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you ever contact Mr. Gipson with respect to publishing your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. False Witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, no, sir.

Senator WELKER. Why didn't you? He had been your friend for many years?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because Mr. Gipson has certain political ideas which are quite alien to the ideas that I set forth in my book. His whole line of books, the Libertarian Books differ with what I have to say in my book and I believe a publisher and editor have a right to publish their reflections of their opinion.

Senator WELKER. You believe, Mr. Matusow, Mr. Gipson of Caxton Printers would fail to publish a book which told the truth about a man who had lied against a fellow individual whether he be a Communist, a murderer, or anyone else?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe Mr. Gipson is quite a truthful man and quite a courageous man and has done quite a bit for this country.

Senator WELKER. Very courageous?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; to get out in Caldwell, Idaho, and start a publishing house and publish literature out there and break away from New York, Boston, and Philadelphia publishing houses and have the guts to stick with it and publish books on the American folklore and the traditions of the West in this country is something very few publishers have the courage to do in this country.

Senator WELKER. You know it to be a fact that had you disclosed the truth to Mr. Gipson, of Caxton Printers, that you were in fact a false witness, that you had betrayed your fellow man, that you had lied to your God, that you had sent people to the penitentiary, long years of suffering, you know good and well that had you had the truth presented to Mr. Gipson that he would have published that book all over the world, do you not believe that to be a fact?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it; it is possible that he would have.

Senator WELKER. Then why didn't you go consult with him at least, give him a first chance to turn down your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I do not want to get into certain personal reasons here.

Senator WELKER. I see. Well, those personal reasons——

Mr. MATUSOW. They have nothing to do with politics now.

Senator WELKER. Nothing to do with politics at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; they have something to do with respect that I have for Mr. Gipson and a certain other relationship I have had in my life.

Senator WELKER. By that, the respect you have for Mr. Gipson, you did not want to tear down his integrity by having him publish your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; that wasn't the point. There are some things involved here which have nothing to do with politics and have nothing to do with Mr. Gipson, but have things to do with, well, things that I'd prefer not to discuss. If you would like, sir, at recess I'll tell you about them and if you feel that, in fairness to the hearing——

Senator WELKER. I want to be fair to you, Mr. Witness, and certainly to my friend, Mr. Gibson, and friend of all these people at the press table.

Mr. MATUSOW. It also has something to do with my relationship with my former wife, and not any intimate relationship. I do not want to imply that, but the relationship——

Senator WELKER. Now, if the chairman will bear with me, yesterday you stated that you came into my State, the State of Idaho, and made some political speeches at Pocatello, Idaho?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Senator WELKER. Who invited you there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody invited me, but when I got there the Republican Party in Pocatello wanted me to speak.

Senator WELKER. Who made the first approach, you or the Republican Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall the Republican Party.

Senator WELKER. How did they know you were coming to Pocatello?

Mr. MATUSOW. I happened to be there and there was a Republican meeting and I sat in.

Senator WELKER. You sat in and told them who you were?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Certainly I do not know of anyone in Pocatello, Idaho, who ever heard of you prior to your appearance there.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I do not know one way or another. It seems the newspapers had got—

Senator WELKER. You impressed or at least attempted to impress Mr. Garrett, the county chairman, at that time and others that you could do quite a job?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I was really boosting myself in those days.

Senator WELKER. No senatorial race was involved in Idaho at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Never said there was; no, sir.

Senator WELKER. You were there campaigning for and in behalf of President Eisenhower?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was campaigning for all Republican candidates.

Senator WELKER. That is right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, who were you campaigning for in Pocatello, Idaho?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the names of the candidates up there.

Senator WELKER. Did you mention the name of any congressional delegate or candidate that was running at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, you know you didn't?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't even know the name of the congressman of the Second District?

Mr. MATUSOW. Give me about a minute and I'll get it for you.

Senator WELKER. Oh, certainly you can find it in the book.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I'll find it in my memory.

Senator WELKER. Did you say anything to that political audience in Pocatello, Idaho, with respect to any congressional delegate or candidate in Idaho?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. I recall the name of the Congressman now. I think it is Hamer Budge.

Senator WELKER. That is right, Hamer Budge.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you recall that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Just this second.

Senator WELKER. Just this second? What did you have to say in your speech with respect to Hamer Budge?

Mr. MATUSOW. Fine things.

Senator WELKER. Fine things?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did he ever ask you to come into Idaho and campaign for him?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, he didn't.

Senator WELKER. And he certainly was not there at your meeting?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was not, sir. I don't even mention him in my book.

Senator WELKER. How much money did you receive from the Republican Party for making that speech to the young high school students?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I got any money.

Senator WELKER. You didn't make any money at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You paid your own expenses, then?

Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody else paid my expenses going through.

Senator WELKER. I'm asking you as I recall your book, you chartered or hired a car from Salt Lake to Pocatello to make this speech?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I hired a car in Salt Lake and had gone up to Montana in it and drove through Pocatello on the way.

Senator WELKER. And you just impressed the committee, had a little meeting that night that you should speak at the high school and at a vast rally?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that was Mr. Garrett's idea, that wasn't my idea.

Senator WELKER. Well, you had to do the legwork before Mr. Garrett even knew who you were?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. It wasn't quite that way. He knew who I was. The Salt Lake papers which I read up in Pocatello had banner headlines with my false testimony before this committee. The American Legion magazine of that month had the featured story by me and about me.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, in 1952 did you campaign in congressional races in Utah; make any speeches?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator DANIEL. For what candidates did you speak there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Senator Watkins, Congressman Dawson, and Congressman—

Senator DANIEL. I think you have already said that that was without the knowledge of Senator Watkins.

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I said the Senator knew I was there, but he didn't know what I was saying.

Senator DANIEL. Yes; who else?

Mr. MATUSOW. And Congressman Stringfellow, I believe, and Gov. J. Bracken Lee.

Senator DANIEL. Did you make speeches for Congressman Stringfellow in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. The point was in Ogden, as I recall. I made 4 or 5 speeches that day. Governor Lee spoke, Congressman Stringfellow spoke, and I spoke for Senator Watkins. Senator Watkins wasn't there.

Senator DANIEL. You did not speak against Walter K. Granger or on behalf of Congressman Stringfellow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I spoke; it was then Congressman Granger who was running for the Senate; he was the brunt of the attack.

Senator DANIEL. You did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you tell any lies on him there in your speech?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, a lot of innuendoes and half truths.

Senator DANIEL. Did you speak in the campaign against Mrs. Reva B. Bosone in 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I made any speeches down in her district. I think I addressed the Republican meeting in Salt Lake City on October 7.

Senator DANIEL. Who asked you to make those speeches in Utah?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, a number of people, sir. I was out there and Mr. Coll, who was then handling part of the campaign.

Senator DANIEL. You offered your services, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Or did they send for you to come out there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, it was a combination of both, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, who sent for you to come out there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I was subpoenaed and went out there for the committee.

Senator DANIEL. So you were already there as a witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And while—

Mr. MATUSOW. But I was going to go out there anyway.

Senator DANIEL. While you were there you offered your services?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, that came about prior to my going. The discussions about whether I was to go out and work in that campaign were held right here in this Senate Office Building. Mr. Don Surine, who was then on the staff of Senator McCarthy, took me around to the office of Senator Watkins, Senator Jenner, Senator Ecton and Senator Cain.

Senator DANIEL. How recently did you believe that Herbert Tank was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, 1952. Hadn't given much thought to it since then.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know him then?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had met him casually in 1949 or 1950. Mr. Tank told me he had no recollection of that meeting. It had nothing to do with politics, by the way. It was at a theater that I met him.

Senator DANIEL. On what did you base your belief that Herbert Tank was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Hearsay evidence.

Senator DANIEL. You had his book in your library as you told the committee yesterday.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I don't recall reading it.

Senator DANIEL. A book which showed that he was a member of the Communist Party, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, in a court of law I'd call that hearsay, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I say just answer me "yes" or "no."

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you have the book there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, but—

Senator DANIEL. You had read the flyleaf of the book that he—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think the flyleaf said he was a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. Let me finish the question. That he was a member of the Communist Party, isn't that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believed him to be one, yes, sir. I think I have stated that.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Now then, how recently did you believe him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. You asked me about it and I said 1952 because I haven't given much thought to Mr. Tank until I met him recently and then I wasn't thinking about his political alliance.

Senator DANIEL. Yes. Back at that time you were thinking about whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir—

Senator DANIEL. Now, what has caused you to change your belief or question your belief as to his membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very important reasons, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, that is what I asked you for. What has caused you to change your mind or to question your former belief as to his membership, being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. One reason, sir, is that I realize that it wasn't my business to go around and start accusing a lot of people of being a lot of things on the basis of hearsay. The second reason—

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, as you well know, that is not an answer to my question. I asked you what caused you to question your previous belief that Herbert Tank was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very simple, sir. I didn't know he was a Communist, that is why I questioned it.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you have accused several people here on hearsay evidence before this committee recently.

Mr. MATUSOW. And the committee has pointed it out to me.

Senator DANIEL. You had it in your mind and your belief that Herb Tank was a member of the Communist Party and you believed that sincerely, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And you had said that you believed it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. All right, now that you have been living with him off and on and staying together with him a considerable part of the time recently, have you changed your mind or questioned your former belief as to his membership?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't give it much thought. We don't talk about politics.

Senator DANIEL. Have you asked him if he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, it is none of my business.

Senator DANIEL. You have never discussed it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, we haven't.

Senator DANIEL. There is nothing to which you can point that has caused you to change your belief that Herbert Tank, your associate, is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. There is a lot of things.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Basically, I didn't know he was a Communist. That changed my belief and as I said, I don't care. It is just simple. I don't know what all the confusion is about.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, let me ask you this. How recently have you believed that Angus Cameron of your publishers was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I never really believed he was a member of the Communist Party, sir. I think I believed he was a Communist-fronter.

Senator DANIEL. Are you changing the testimony that you have previously given this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I might have said Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. I want to caution you, Mr. Matusow, that you have told this committee that you believed that Angus Cameron was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I might have said that but I'm talking about what I believed.

Senator DANIEL. Are you denying that, are you changing that testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm not changing any testimony. Let's get the answer to your question, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That is what I asked you, whether or not you are changing your testimony previously given this committee that you believed Angus Cameron to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I don't believe I said I believed him to be a member of the Communist Party but rather, I said—

Senator DANIEL. Are you denying that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said that he was a Communist-fronter and I believe the record will show that. If the record does not show that, then it is an incorrect mention in the record.

(Senator McClellan is present at this time.)

Senator DANIEL. Well, have you ever believed that Mr. Kahn was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, and I have accused him of it.

Senator DANIEL. And how recently did you believe that Mr. Kahn, your other publisher, was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Up until very recently.

Senator DANIEL. How recently?

Mr. MATUSOW. June of 1954 when I accused him of it in testimony.

Senator DANIEL. And what has happened to cause you to question your belief that Mr. Kahn is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I found out, point 1, that the Kahn that I had accused of being a Communist was a different Kahn, not the same man.

Senator DANIEL. Now you are telling this committee that you accused the wrong man? You weren't thinking about your publisher?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir. There were four or five—

Senator DANIEL. What is the name of the Kahn that you had accused?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember his first name now but he wrote a different book,

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm telling you the truth, sir. Whether you accept it or not, I do not know. I presume you are not accepting it.

Senator DANIEL. You are telling the truth now. You have not told the committee the truth in your previous testimony before this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, come now, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You have previously told the committee that you believed your publisher, Mr. Kahn, was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I just said I still believed, in the past—

Senator DANIEL. You still believe it?

Mr. MATUSOW. In the past I believed he was a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. What has caused you to change your opinion?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no knowledge of whether he is or is not, that is what changed my opinion.

Senator DANIEL. That changed your opinion. Have you asked him if he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, and I never intend to. It is none of my business.

Senator DANIEL. All right, Mr. Sourwine.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Sourwine resumes his interrogation, I want to go back to Idaho.

Mr. MATUSOW. Fine State.

Senator WELKER. You say you were up there to make political speeches?

Mr. MATUSOW. I made a few political speeches; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you appeared at the Pocatello High School?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pocatello High School and I made a speech down at Silver Spring.

Senator WELKER. And then you appeared before another group at the auditorium in Pocatello High School?

Mr. MATUSOW. Spoke to the students of the Pocatello High School then to an adult group at the Pocatello High School, and a speech, about 2 weeks later or 10 days later.

Senator WELKER. You want to tell this committee that you made a political speech before the young people of Pocatello High?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, yes, sir, I did. It wasn't supposed to be political but it was.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, I am reading the first paragraph of the Idaho State Journal, Pocatello, Idaho, Friday, October 10, 1952:

A former member of the Communist Party who later became an underground operator for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, held a Pocatello High School audience spellbound Friday with stories of his experiences.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And nowhere in that article can I find anything that you said with respect to the candidacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Hamer Budge or any other candidate.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, if you had read the next story, "Police To Watch at Matusow Talk" which is also on that page, you will understand how political that speech was, sir. I attacked the New York Times, I attacked Time magazine, I attacked the Democratic Party as the party of treason. I really went to town and had those kids reeling.

Senator WELKER. In the high schools?

Mr. MATUSOW. In the high school, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you see, have you ever heard of a tape recording of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, but I had a tape recording. I don't know if I ever received it. Mr. Garrett was supposed to send it to me, of the speech I made the following week.

Senator WELKER. How about the original one before the young boys and girls?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not think there was a tape recording made of the high school speech.

Senator WELKER. You don't think there was?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I don't recall any made.

Senator WELKER. Well, you know, as a matter of fact, before you entered that auditorium before the young people you were instructed that nothing of a political vein should be spoken about?

Mr. MATUSOW. But, sir, you know as well as I that I was instructed that, but it is quite easy to get the political subtleties into any speech.

Senator WELKER. I see the political subtleties.

Mr. MATUSOW. Especially with young people.

Senator WELKER. From your vast experience in the field of communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now one more question with the indulgence of the chairman. On page 165 of your book under the headline from the Idaho State Journal issue of October 10, 1952, as you so dramatically brought out a moment ago, "Police To Watch at Matusow Talk."

Now, I want to go down to another paragraph under that Pocatello release, a release from Great Falls, Mont., from United Press, wherein it states:

Harvey Matusow, an FBI undercover agent who worked his way into the Communist Party to find out what was going on, did not make his expected talk at the Farmers Union convention here Saturday.

The Farmers Union had challenged Matusow to repeat his charges that the farm organization had been infiltrated by Communists. But Matusow, V. O. Overcash, the manager of his Montana tour, and Farmers Union officials failed to agree on terms, so the talk never came off. The Farmers Union had reportedly requested a \$25,000 financial responsibility bond before the talk, to protect it against possible "inflammatory" statements.

Is that a correct report?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, you did not want to appear before the Farmers Union at Great Falls, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, no, sir, I looked forward to it.

Senator WELKER. You did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You were going to tell the truth then about the Farmers Union as you knew it, were you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was going to tell lies as I purported to have it be the truth; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. I see. That is why, then, you weren't able to get a \$25,000 bond?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. The bond wasn't there, but—

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, you never even thought of a bond, did you? That wasn't the reason why you didn't appear?

Mr. MATUSOW. I appeared at the Farmers Union Hall and was stopped from going up to the platform.

Senator WELKER. Why?

Mr. MATUSOW. I flew up from—

Senator WELKER. Why were you stopped from going to the platform?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because the Farmers Union wanted a \$25,000 bond.

Senator WELKER. And you weren't able to furnish that?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you ask anyone to help you furnish that bond?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I didn't ask anybody to furnish that bond.

Senator WELKER. You immediately turned tail and went over the hill immediately after?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, no, I didn't, sir. I don't turn tail that easily.

Senator WELKER. Well, I think you do.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I know I don't.

Senator WELKER. We will discuss that another day. But you didn't address the publicized debate that you were to have with officials of the Farmers Union; did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. That night I made the same speech and recorded it and sent the recorded copy to the Farmers Union if they wanted to take action.

Senator WELKER. That was going in the back door when you preferred to go in the front door?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, they wouldn't let me speak at their convention; I had to record my own speech.

Senator WELKER. I see.

Mr. MATUSOW. Right.

Senator WELKER. That is all.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, did you once honestly and sincerely believe that the Communist conspiracy was a danger and a threat to the United States Government?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator DANIEL. How recently have you held that belief?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, up until maybe a year, year and a half ago, year ago, less than a year maybe.

Senator DANIEL. Less than a year ago?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I was mighty confused.

Senator DANIEL. And you have now changed your opinion on that subject?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not quite.

Senator DANIEL. Well, do you still believe that the Communist conspiracy is a danger and threat to the United States Government?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I will answer that question but I'd like to elaborate on it briefly after I answer it "Yes" or "No."

Senator DANIEL. Answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer is "Yes, partially," and this is why.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, give me a "Yes" or "No" answer as to whether or not you believe it and then explain.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will then explain. Yes. You see, sir, I believe—and this is why I wrote my book and why I now believe that I have something to say—that the whole national picture is one of people being anti. People in this country have, I believe, forgotten what it is to be for something. They have forgotten the traditions that made this country great, the real thing that went to make this country, that built the State of Idaho, sir, that built the great State of Texas, the real folk traditions of things that made people fight for what they had. Today people in this country accept the philosophy of being

against things without knowing why they are for anything. People don't even know what the Constitution of this country means any more.

This is what I felt at one time. I woke up to the fact that it is about time I stopped being anti. That is anti-anything. I'm for something. I'm for this Constitution; I'm for the country, and I'm for God and therefore, sir, I can't see myself being anti-Communist. There is no such thing as being anti-Communist. I'm pro-United States, pro-American Constitution. And if anything wants to come in the way, well, I'll fight it but I'm going to start out by building a stronger country and a stronger Constitution, helping implement the Constitution as it exists and not destroy it by attacking people because they happen to use the Constitution of the United States as it was intended, as the fifth amendment meant.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, do you think the "Daily Worker" is pro-American and prodemocracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think it is a poor newspaper.

Senator DANIEL. Poor newspaper?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Are you now, do you wish to leave the committee with the impression that you are now anti-Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm against the Communist Party, and I don't believe the Communist Party in this country is capable of anything.

Senator DANIEL. You are anti-Communist now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; of course, I am.

Senator DANIEL. You are. Why?

Mr. MATUSOW. But first, I'm pro-Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you think there is still a danger, the Communist Party, the Communist conspiracy is still a danger to our country, do you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, why are you against it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Why, because I don't believe in the ideas, the philosophical approach of the Communist Party, but I don't think any Communist Party membership in this United States is capable of destroying this country. I don't think that any of the spies—and they must exist—Soviet spies in the country are members of the Communist Party. If anybody is going to be a spy, he is going to be far removed, very far removed from the Communist Party of the United States. The people of this country don't understand that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Just a moment, why are you against the Communist Party, then?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I'm against communism and the Communist Party because I happen to be a Republican for the same reason you are not a Republican, sir. You are a Democrat.

Senator WELKER. You are not inferring that the distinguished chairman is in favor of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't say that, sir.

Senator WELKER. You said you were against the Communist Party because you were a Republican.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is alien to my belief as a Republican, that is all, sir.

Senator WELKER. I see.

Senator DANIEL. And that is the only reason that you are against the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, it wants to change the system of government that I like, which is the same difference.

Senator DANIEL. And because you are against the Communist Party, it would concern you greatly if your book were published by members of that party, would it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, because I am for the Communist Party's right to preach whatever they want to preach in this country so long as it gets up on a platform and sounds off and lets people hear what they have to say.

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. The Constitution of this country gives the right to everybody to say what he pleases so long as he doesn't pick up a gun and start shooting up the place.

Senator DANIEL. So you are for the Communist Party on some things?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm for the right of the Communist Party as well as I am for the right of any Fascist to get up and make any speeches he wants to make and advocate anything he wants to advocate so long as it doesn't destroy this Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Even though it is advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force?

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir, are we going to outlaw the vegetarians because they want to kill the cattle industry?

Senator WELKER. Answer the question, I would suggest.

Mr. MATUSOW. I think that answers the question.

Senator DANIEL. I think maybe it does answer the question. You are comparing the people of this country and the overthrow of this country to the cattle of the country!

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I said the vegetarian party would like to outlaw the use of slaughterhouses and the big ranching industry which affects your State, I presume, and how about some of these other minority parties who have certain beliefs which are diametrically opposed to the United States? We aren't going out and outlaw them. I think this country is big enough to be able to take anything that the Communists have to offer and stand up to it and say, "Well you can't take us over."

Senator DANIEL. Now, let us go back to the last question.

Are you for the Communist Party or its purported right to express itself even to the extent of advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am for the Communist Party's right to advocate anything until they decide they want to do something about it, then I'll take action.

Senator DANIEL. You are for the Communist Party advocating overthrow of the Government by force up to the point of—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know if they do.

Senator DANIEL. Let me finish the question, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry.

Senator DANIEL. Up until the point where there is action; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, to start with—

Senator DANIEL. I just want to get it clear.

Mr. MATUSOW. It can't be correct, sir, because I don't agree with your hypothesis and if you have an incorrect hypothesis at the start you can't have a correct conclusion, and therefore I cannot answer the question.

Senator WELKER. I suggest to the chairman that you answer the question or say you are unable to answer it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm unable to answer the question based on an incorrect hypothesis. I believe in a correct hypothesis.

Senator DANIEL. On what other things are you for the Communist Party today?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm against segregation, sir. The Communist Party is against that, I presume, so I'm for them on that score.

Senator DANIEL. You don't identify everyone who is against segregation with the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the point; we shouldn't identify everybody.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you don't want to do it, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I asked you on what other things that the Communist Party stands for that you agree with them and you are for them. On what things?

Mr. MATUSOW. I like to consider myself a good trade unionist and when the Communist Party advocates certain good trade-union policies that go along with those that I agree with, I am for it.

Senator DANIEL. And you are for the Communist Party publishing any book that it wants regardless of the motive, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what their motive is.

Senator DANIEL. I say regardless of the motive, are you for them publishing any book they want?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm for their right to publish, yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And you would help them with that, would you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. If somebody tried to take their right away I will help them, yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You would help them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Defend to the death their right to publish.

Senator DANIEL. Senator McClellan, do you have a question?

Senator McCLELLAN. If I may just ask one question. I understood you to say you were against the Communist Party simply because you were a Republican, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I was drawing an analogy, sir. I said, In a similar sense.

Senator McCLELLAN. What analogy do you draw between Democrats and the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Democrats are just as much opposed to, or different from the Communist Party as the Republicans are. I happen to be a Republican and that is why I said that.

Senator McCLELLAN. You do not claim that the Democrats are any more favorable as such to the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, no such claims.

Senator McCLELLAN. I just wanted to get that straight, that is all.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, I wish to go into a series of questions concerning your appearance before the Texas Industrial Commission in 1953. You appeared there as a witness voluntarily, did you not, at Austin, Texas?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was invited down and appeared voluntarily.

Senator DANIEL. And I believe you already testified that no one suggested what you should say or forced you or asked you to give the answers that they wanted, is that not true?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Was there any reason for anyone in connection with the Texas Industrial Commission hearing to doubt the truth of what you were saying under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. I know of no reason why they should have; no, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And you were sworn before you testified?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, it was sworn testimony.

Senator DANIEL. Did you give true and correct answers as to your name and birth and background?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, in relation to that, I presume so. I have never seen the record there and before I answer any questions on that I would like to submit to the committee that I have the right and I would like to read that testimony and familiarize myself with it before answering questions which my—

Senator DANIEL. You don't recall any false testimony concerning your name and your birth and background?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I believe in relation to any answers to any specific testimony before the Texas Industrial Commission, I believe that is what it was called, I would want to read that testimony, familiarize myself with it prior to answering questions. Otherwise, I am going to have to decline to answer questions on that.

Senator DANIEL. I think you are correct except as to whether or not you recall.

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall my name and birthday.

Senator DANIEL. Having given false answers before the commission concerning name and background?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think, sir, that answering any question on any testimony before the commission would in effect deny me the right if I decided it were necessary for me to use it, to decline to answer.

Senator DANIEL. I will read you the first question and answer:

Will you state your name and address?

Answer: Harvey M. Matusow, M-a-t-u-s-o-w.

Was that a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I'm going to decline to answer any question dealing with that document you have there in that hearing until I have had a chance to read it. I'm going to have to do so because that I believe it is my right under the Constitution of the United States.

Senator WELKER. What right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir. I am going to, right now, do something which I do not want to do and I will not do after I have read that, but on any questions relating to that I am going to use the privilege afforded me by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Senator DANIEL. You are going to take the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States on my question as to whether or not—to the question asked you before the Texas Industrial Commission: "Will you please state your name and address," and the answer, "Harvey M. Matusow," that you are going to claim the fifth amendment and not say whether that is true or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, you, as a lawyer, know any answer I give, relating to any question or answer in that document, any answer I give, negative or positive, would by right and by law waive my rights to any other answers that I might decline to answer in relation to that volume. Now, I want to state for the record that I do not want to, and I probably will not after I have read that testimony, invoke any rights, but right now I'm unfamiliar with it—excuse me, sir.

Senator WELKER. He has taken the fifth amendment.

Mr. MATUSOW. Not quite that simple. That is what you have been trying to do to many people, just saying they are taking the fifth amendment. I don't want to take the fifth amendment, but I want to familiarize myself with the testimony and when I am familiar with that testimony I can assure you I will answer your questions straightforward and brief and to the point.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, let me say as chairman of the committee, unless overruled by other members of the committee, I'm going to read to you a question and the answer from this committee report for several minutes here. Unless you take the fifth amendment, I'm going to read it, the question and answer, and I'm going to make it available to you to see it in writing as I am reading it to you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I would like to, if it is agreeable to the chairman to take—if I presume we are going to go this afternoon—if I may borrow that document from you over the luncheon recess and read it, and I can assure you, sir, I will most probably answer every question and I would say right now probably answer any question you put to me in relation to that document once I have had a chance to read it.

Senator DANIEL. You don't have any question as to whether I would misread it to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I don't, but I would like to, because I have never read that document, familiarize myself with the testimony.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, that is the very reason that I do not intend to proceed on that basis. I do not intend to give you several hours during the recess to read what you have sworn to previously and then tell us whether or not it is true or false.

Mr. MATUSOW. Then I can assure you—

Senator DANIEL. I wish to read it now to you so that you can tell us without yourself having a chance to study it and get counsel on the matters from—

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, you do not want to deny me right to counsel? This is my right.

Senator DANIEL. Counsel is there; he can advise you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Fine, sir. I don't even want advice from counsel on this. I am familiar enough with the law to know that I am not going to, for many reasons, answer any of your questions because I believe—now maybe I'm wrong but I believe—that the State of Texas is going to start nosing around next week when I'm down in Texas because you know as well as I that I am going to be there next Monday and I am not going to answer any questions one way or another because I think the fifth amendment to the Constitution affords me a protection in relation to answering those questions.

Senator DANIEL. All right, do you claim the fifth amendment and refuse to answer on the grounds that it might incriminate you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, the fifth amendment protects the innocent and guilty.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you for a "Yes" or "No" answer. Do you take the fifth amendment and refuse to reply to the question I have asked you on the grounds that it might incriminate you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not on the grounds that it might incriminate me; that is not the fifth amendment. Let us quote that properly.

Senator DANIEL. On what grounds; state them?

Mr. MATUSOW. I will not answer questions in relation to the Texas Industrial Commission and the reason given is the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Let us have it quoted correctly.

Senator DANIEL. That is all.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MATUSOW. You know, sir, the fifth amendment says nobody in this country has to be a witness against themselves.

Senator DANIEL. Just a minute. I don't believe anyone has asked you a question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I am answering the question anyway.

Senator DANIEL. I offer for the files of the committee a certified transcript of the proceedings before the Texas Industrial Commission in Austin, Tex., December 4, 5, and 6, 1953, certified by Agnes E. Miller, official shorthand reporter. I ask you—

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest you read into the record the certificate of the document you hold in your hand.

Senator DANIEL. The certificate reads as follows and I will show it to you, Mr. Matusow, and your attorney.

STATE OF TEXAS,

*County of Travis:*

I, Agnes E. Miller, reporter, State board of control, hereby certify that the foregoing 222 pages of volume L constitute a true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes taken of the meeting of the Texas Industrial Commission held in the State Capitol Building, Austin, Tex., to investigate alleged Communist domination of certain labor organizations in the State of Texas, being that portion of the meeting held December 4, 1953, afternoon and night sessions and December 5, 1953, morning sessions, witness my hand on this 12th day of March 1953.

AGNES E. MILLER.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would also suggest—

Senator DANIEL. Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. I would also suggest you read the caption of the document to further identify it.

Senator DANIEL. For further identification the caption of the document reads:

Meeting of the Texas Industrial Commission to investigate alleged Communist domination of certain labor organizations in the State of Texas held in the State Capitol Building in Austin, Tex., on December 4, 5, and 6, 1953.

And on page 63 these words:

Mr. Harvey M. Matusow, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Now, Mr. Matusow, you may examine this document and the certificate if you desire to do so.

Mr. MATUSOW. If I have time to read the document, sir, and as I told you, I will be glad to answer questions about it, but up until the

time that I am given a chance to read that document and consult counsel about that document, I am going to decline to answer any questions in relation to it or identify it in any way, shape, or form.

Senator DANIEL. All right, Mr. Matusow, I will ask you whether or not in reply to a question by Mr. Lyerly as follows:

Will you please state your name and address?

You replied:

Harvey M. Matusow, Santa Fe, N. Mex., and New York City.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, as an attorney, you ought to know that if I answered that question, I'd waive any rights to any—

Senator DANIEL. I simply ask you if you gave—if that was your answer to that question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, you are asking me to be witness against myself and I am going to decline to answer that question and I am going to use the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment to the Constitution and as I state again until such time as I have a chance to read that document. I do not want to use the fifth amendment, I want to answer all your questions but I think you are denying me the right to read that document and answer your question.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, take the fifth amendment without making a speech each time.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I'm going to do so, sir.

Senator DANIEL. On the same page, on 63, this question by Mr. Lyerly:

After your discharge in August of 1946, what employment did you undertake?

I will ask you if this was your answer and if it was a true answer.

First job I had was with an advertising agency, Gray Advertising Agency in New York, and at that time I was going to college, City College of New York, 1946 and 1947.

Mr. MATUSOW. The fifth amendment to the Constitution provides me certain protection and I am going to use it and decline to answer that question, sir.

Senator DANIEL. A question from page 64:

Having developed that information of your background and experience for the purpose of this commission, I would like to ask you a direct question, Mr. Matusow. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

And your answer was:

I have.

Was that your answer and was it a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Fifth amendment affords me certain protections against being witness against myself, sir. I am going to have to decline to answer that question on those grounds and I want the record to show that it is the committee's responsibility for not getting at these facts, for denying me a right to read that transcript.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, I have asked you once and before you are held to be in contempt of this committee, I want to say to you that you can claim the fifth amendment without a speech on each occasion.

If you so desire—

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman—

Senator DANIEL. Yes, Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. I suggest that immediately after he takes the fifth amendment the Chair order him to answer the question. He says he doesn't want to testify against himself. He has been putting on an exhibition here for a week of testifying against himself all the time. I think the witness, if he is going to be asked the questions, should be ordered to answer them.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, I hereby order and direct you to answer the question I have just put to you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, I hereby order and direct you to answer the first question I put to you which was as to whether your name and address were correctly given, whether that was your answer to the question, on page 63, and whether or not it is a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of protection afforded me by the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. I hereby order and direct you to answer the second question which I asked you concerning this testimony, on page 63, whether or not the answer which I read:

The first job I had was with an advertising agency, the Gray Advertising Agency in New York, and at that time I was going to college, City College of New York, 1946 and 1947—

Was that your answer and whether or not it was a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and the protection afforded me therein.

Senator DANIEL. And is it your intention to take the fifth amendment and decline to answer even though you are ordered to answer question which I asked you concerning this testimony, on page 63, mission, as to whether or not you gave true and correct answers there before that commission?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is, sir.

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you do not mind telling the committee that you gave false testimony where it helped out the Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. It is not so, that is not so.

Senator DANIEL. You do not mind doing that, do you—you haven't taken the fifth amendment on any of this evidence that you think will help get some of the 13 Communists out of jail?

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir—

Senator DANIEL. Have you?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is not so; that is not so.

Senator DANIEL. I say, have you taken the fifth amendment—

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. On any evidence or any question asked you which would show that you lied in an attempt to save some of these Communists who have been convicted from serving their sentence—have you taken the fifth amendment on anything else?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; no, sir, and I would not have taken the fifth amendment on this if I had been given a chance to read that testimony first.

Senator DANIEL. Will you explain to the committee why you wish to read the testimony before answering whether or not truthful answers were given?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very simple reason, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That is what I want to know.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have got to be in the State of Texas again next week, and I want to know what to prepare myself for.

Senator DANIEL. All right.

Senator McCLELLAN. I suggest you ask the witness 2 or 3 more pertinent questions and follow the same procedure.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, before asking you these additional questions and before you elect to claim the fifth amendment, I am going to ask Mr. Sourwine, counsel, to instruct you as to the understanding of the committee as to your rights in claiming the fifth amendment and as to our duties in connection therewith.

Mr. SOURWINE. The committee, Mr. Matusow, also have a mind to recognize your claim of privilege under the fifth amendment, provided you claim it properly.

You are informed that you do not have the privilege of refusing to answer a question, unless you state that you honestly fear that a truthful answer to the question would form at least the link in a chain which would tend to incriminate you. You have a wide latitude in deciding for yourself whether a truthful answer to any particular question will in fact form a link in a chain which will incriminate you, but the committee or the Chair has the right to inquire into your "bonafideness" in claiming or attempting to claim the privilege and in that connection, then, it is proper for the committee to inquire whether you do in fact fear that a truthful answer to that question would form at least a link in a chain that would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand that, sir. Were you asking me a question on that?

Senator DANIEL. No.

Mr. MATUSOW. What was my reason?

Senator DANIEL. He was simply advising you of what the committee's understanding of your rights was.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Happen to be.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. From page 63 of the hearing.

Question. When did you first join the Communist Party?

Answer. In October of 1947.

Was that your answer and was it a true answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am going to have to decline to answer that question, basing my declining on the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. You are ordered and directed to answer the question, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am going to have to decline to answer that question, basing my answer on the fifth amendment and the protection afforded me therein.

Senator WELKER. In order to save time, Mr. Chairman, since it is apparent that he is going to take the fifth amendment on this whole line of interrogation—counsel, may I have your attention? Can we stipulate?

Mr. FAULKNER. I am listening.

Senator WELKER. Can we stipulate that he will take the fifth amendment upon the grounds heretofore designated and assigned by him, and that it is further stipulated that the acting chairman, Senator Daniel, of Texas, directs and orders him to answer the question? That will save us a good deal of time.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am not prepared to stipulate anything; I am sorry.

Senator WELKER. That is perfectly all right with me, Counselor. I am sorry that you would not try to save a little time, but I will be here as long as you are, Counselor.

Senator DANIEL. A question from page 70:

Keeping it in chronological order, and moving on to your activities as a member of the Communist Party, what employment or what full-time employment did you have in the various Communist Party groups?

And your answer as reported on page 71:

Well, I worked for the Jefferson School, both at the New York school, which is at 575 6th Avenue, New York, and their summer camp in 1948, which is in Monticello, N. Y. I then worked for People's Songs, Communist Cultural Group, and then the Wholesale Book Corp.; then I worked for Camp Tunison, Communist summer camp in New York State. And I also worked for the Communist Party itself.

Now, Mr. Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. I am listening to you, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I am about to ask you whether or not that is the answer that you gave and whether or not it is a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am going to have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. You are ordered and directed to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer on the ground of the protection afforded me in bearing witness against myself provided in the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. From page 75:

Mr. Matusow, this Industrial Commission of Texas, is conducting this study and investigation for the purpose of uncovering any subversive activities with respect to three specific unions. These unions are the Distributive Processing and Office Workers of America, the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, and the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. Are you familiar with these unions?

And you answer:

I am.

Was that your answer and was it a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, sir, basing my declination on the grounds of the United States Constitution and the fifth amendment in it.

Senator DANIEL. The Chair orders you to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, basing my answer on the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution, against bearing witness against myself.

(Conference between Senators and Counsel Sourwine.)

Senator DANIEL. Now from page 80 of this record.

Question: Passing on, Mr. Matusow, now to the United Office and Professional Workers Union, which was predecessor to the Distributive Processing and Office Workers of America, are you familiar with that particular union?

Answer. Yes, I was a member.

Was that your answer and was it a true and correct answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the ground of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and the protection afforded me therein.

Senator DANIEL. You are ordered and directed to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. My answer once again will be the declination on the grounds of the United States Constitution, and the fifth amendment which gives me the right not to bear witness against myself.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, without reference to this committee hearing in this proceeding—I mean the Texas commission hearing—without reference to that record and to that proceeding—

Mr. MATUSOW. I am going—

Senator DANIEL. Were you a member—were you a member of the United Office and Professional Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. You are not referring at all to the State of Texas in this hearing now?

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I want to get the answer clear.

Senator DANIEL. You have the right idea—I am asking you independently of this commission proceeding. Were you a member of the United Office and Professional Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me.

(Consultation between counsel and Mr. Matusow.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I was just checking something on the waiver rights. Yes, sir, I was a member of the UOPWA.

Senator DANIEL. Was it a predecessor to the Distributive and Processing Office Workers of America?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is one of the unions which went to make up the UOPWA.

Senator DANIEL. You are familiar with those particular unions?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I had some familiarity with it.

Senator DANIEL. What local were you a member of?

Mr. MATUSOW. Local 16 and 21.

Senator DANIEL. Where?

Mr. MATUSOW. In New York City.

Senator DANIEL. What was the purpose of this, was there a guild in connection with this union, the Advertising Guild?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was local 21, as I recall.

Senator DANIEL. That was the name of local 21?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. What is the purpose of this guild?

Mr. MATUSOW. Organized union among copywriters, artists, layout artists, and other people employed in advertising agencies in and around New York.

Senator DANIEL. But your membership was transferred over to local 16 of the United Office and Professional Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. CIO, yes, sir; it was a CIO union at the time.

Senator DANIEL. What are some of the individuals—who were some of the individuals in that union who were also members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall offhand if I knew—I knew one. I am trying to think of her name.

Senator DANIEL. What is his name?

Mr. MATUSOW. Her name. I do not recall offhand. I will think about it, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know about eight people who belonged to the Communist Party, who were also members of local 21?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think when I testified before this Senate committee I might have given more than eight names, but I did not know they were Communists.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know Nola Sacco and her husband Joe?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir—I did not know them as Communists.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know Lester Talkington?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir. We are just—again no reference to the Texas commission hearing?

Senator DANIEL. I am asking—

Mr. MATUSOW. I wanted to be clear on that.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking whether or not you knew Lester Talkington to be a member of the Communist Party, and also a member of local 21?

Mr. MATUSOW. Do I understand the question is not relating to the Texas Industrial Commission hearing?

Senator WELKER. The question is perfectly apparent.

Senator DANIEL. It is clear; the question is clear. You might ask your attorney if there is any question about it. I am asking you the question independently of anything that you might have testified to before, about the matter.

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, that is what I wanted to know, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That is right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I knew these people, but I did not know them as—would you go over the names again?

Senator DANIEL. Nola Sacco and her husband Joe?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not know them as Communists: no—they were trade-union people.

Senator DANIEL. A fellow named Lester Talkington?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew him. I believe he was a Communist, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You knew him to belong, to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is kind of hazy.

Senator DANIEL. He is also a member of local No. 21?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Was he the president of local No. 21?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe he was, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know a person named Florice Garten?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I did not know her as a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know Norma Aronson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And was she president of local No. 16?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Have you attended Communist Party meetings with her?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you go to Puerto Rico in 1949 on a trip sponsored by the Communist Party, along with Norma Aronson?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you go to Puerto Rico at all in 1949?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. On a trip sponsored by whom?

Mr. MATUSOW. By the Communist Party, New York County office.

Senator DANIEL. Was Nola Sacco on the trip?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. What was the purpose of the trip?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was the Communist Party version of the Radio-TV Bermuda Cruise—I won a contest in the Communist Party and got a Caribbean trip from it.

Senator DANIEL. What other person was on that trip?

Mr. MATUSOW. A man named Bassett went down there with me.

Senator DANIEL. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; he was a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. What was his full name?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the first name—Bassett. Probably in there. Refresh my recollection.

Senator DANIEL. What about Ethel Beach?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not know her as a Communist.

Senator DANIEL. Was she on this trip to Puerto Rico?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Was Winifred Norman, what about her?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; she was not on the trip.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know her to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator DANIEL. Winifred Norman?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. What about Ethel Beach. Did you know her to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Another organizer named Jack Greenspan. Did you know him to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Aaron Kramer, did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know him to be a member of local 16?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; a union man.

Senator DANIEL. Did the Communist Party instruct you as a member to hire out through these local unions for various jobs?

Mr. MATUSOW. No.

Senator DANIEL. Were you ever instructed to get a job in a direct mail house for organizing purposes?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, the union asked me if I would do that; yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. The union did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. For union organizing purposes?

Mr. MATUSOW. For union—the shop was organized. It was to keep the shop well organized, so that the company would not start a company union and bust it up.

Senator DANIEL. Was the union dominated by members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not know about it. There were Communists in the union.

Senator DANIEL. Officials of the union were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew Communist Party members were in the union—how many officials I do not know.

Senator DANIEL. Of the membership of the United Office and Professional Workers, what percentage of that membership were actually members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea; the union was quite large, and it couldn't have been a high percentage.

Senator DANIEL. Wasn't it true that an overwhelming majority were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Whoa, if I ever said that, that is a real whopper.

Senator DANIEL. You say, you volunteered that, if you ever testified to that, it was a whopper. Is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. It was a lie; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. A whopper, the same difference, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Of the overall membership—

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, that "whopper" and "lie"—I want it identified; you say "whopper" means a big lie.

Mr. MATUSOW. A mighty big one.

Senator DANIEL. Did you testify that, I mean, is this true or not, that of the leadership an overwhelming majority were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Again, sir, you started out with, did I testify?

Senator DANIEL. I changed it.

Mr. MATUSOW. Again, my understanding, if I may, sir, just to address the Chair for a moment, at any time if you are going to revert back to, if we have this understanding to that testimony, in Texas, if I am informed of it, I mean so that I don't in answering questions slip and waive that right which I want to keep.

Senator DANIEL. Independently of any questions concerning what you testified to in Austin, Tex., is it true that the leadership of the union, of the leadership, an overwhelming majority were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I had no knowledge of that.

Senator DANIEL. If you ever testified to that, was that a "whopper," too?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had no knowledge of it. It apparently was not true, sir.

Senator WELKER. That did not answer it.

Senator DANIEL. You said a moment ago freely—you volunteered that it was a big lie.

Mr. MATUSOW. When you said the overwhelming majority of the members in the union now you are asking about leadership.

Senator DANIEL. You testified that an overwhelming majority of it. Is that a little lie or a big lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. A smaller lie, fewer people, I included more people in the first one.

Senator DANIEL. It was a lie, though, correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, it is a falsehood.

Senator DANIEL. You testified Norma Aaronson, you testified she was a leader in that union local 16?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that she was.

Senator DANIEL. Would you say most of her activities were directed by the Communist Party with respect to what the union was to do?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea, sir.

Senator DANIEL. If you ever testified that that is correct, that was a false answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was a question of surmise on my part. It was not based on fact.

Senator DANIEL. Would it be a fair statement to say that the interests of her, that is, Norma Aaronson, the interests—I beg your pardon.

(Consultation between Senator Welker and Senator Daniel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir, I just have a question I want to ask my counsel.

(Consultation between Mr. Matusow and counsel.)

Senator WELKER. Does the record show the consultation?

The REPORTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

Senator DANIEL. Would it be a fair statement to say that the interests of, the actions by the officers of the union, were to the interests of the Communist Party rather than to the interest of the union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall, sir. I wouldn't know one way or another.

Senator DANIEL. You have no knowledge at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know one way or another, sir, a long time since I was in that union.

Senator DANIEL. If you so testified, previously, that that was the interest of the officers or the union, and their actions were to the interest of the Communist Party rather than to the interests of the union, was that true or false?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not remember, sir. No recollection.

Senator DANIEL. If the policy of the union did not hurt the Communist Party would the union go ahead with that policy?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I'm just losing all kinds of recollection about the testimony I gave at any time about that union. It is just kind of hazy in my mind. I would like to read that and study the matter a bit and when I do I will answer the questions.

Senator DANIEL. Are you giving us the truthful answer to that question?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I have no recollection about the union at that point, that is a truthful answer.

Senator DANIEL. You have suddenly lost all recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not all recollection—about that one question you asked me.

Senator DANIEL. About that lawsuit—we will pass on.

Mr. MATUSOW. Some questions I do recall but some I don't.

Senator WELKER. I would like to make this observation, that since this consultation with counsel, apparently, the witness has changed his attitude with respect to his memory.

Mr. MATUSOW. Might I suggest that an impression is trying to be left here, but consultation with counsel was not related to anything which I am saying now.

Senator WELKER. I am making an observation as a member of this committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, but I would like the record to show that maybe that is not quite clear.

(Senator Eastland entered the room.)

Mr. FAULKNER. I would like the record to be clear on this, if I may, because an inference was left by Senator Welker which is wholly unfounded, and I might say—

Senator WELKER. Just a moment, please, I believe it is the policy of this committee that you are here as a guest. I do not care to debate the matter with you. I made my own observation, I will fall or stand upon that. And as one member of this committee, I would desire not to debate the matter with you at this time. However, I am ready, willing and happy to meet you in debate any time.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will accept the challenge. But when my name is brought into the thing, I think I have a right to respond to any unfair, unfounded, untrue inference that you are trying to leave in this room today.

Senator WELKER. The matter will speak for itself, counsel.

Mr. FAULKNER. I know it will.

Senator DANIEL. Passing on to the activities of the other two labor unions which were under consideration there in Austin but without any reference to the Commission hearing, I believe that you are familiar with the International Fur & Leather Workers Union, is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have known about the union, yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you do some work with the Fur and Leather Workers Union in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall having done some at this time. It is possible.

Senator DANIEL. During the period when you were a full-fledged member of the Communist Party, did you come in contact with any of the officers of the International Fur & Leather Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I believe I did.

Senator DANIEL. Will you state some of those individuals?

Mr. MATUSOW. Irving Potash.

Senator DANIEL. Go on—name any others.

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh—

Senator DANIEL. Did you know Mr. Potash to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I did.

Senator DANIEL. All right, will you name the others?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall any others right now.

Senator DANIEL. What about Ben Gold?

Mr. MATUSOW. Never met him, not that I recall.

Senator DANIEL. He was president of the Fur & Leather Workers Union was he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Some title, some office, might have been president. Senator DANIEL. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Ben Gold?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. How did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. He publicly admitted it.

Senator DANIEL. Did you see him at a Communist Party headquarters meeting?

Mr. MATUSOW. Might have, don't recall, no; it is possible.

Senator DANIEL. When you joined the Communist Party was he a member of the national executive committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that he might have been—I am not sure now.

Senator DANIEL. Did he take part any time in party activities very actively?

Mr. MATUSOW. Might have.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you for a truthful answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember.

Senator DANIEL. Of your own knowledge do you know whether he was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. If he was an active member of it, of course he took part in the activities of the Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. That is all I asked.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is simple.

Senator DANIEL. Did he or did he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. He must have.

Senator DANIEL. It does not call for an "I don't remember" answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not have any personal knowledge of it but I presume a national committee member of it, when I was a Communist I presume that he would be active in the Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking of your own knowledge, did Mr. Ben Gold, president of the Fur & Leather Workers Union, take any active interest in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Of my own knowledge, I'd have to say I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. Who was his second in command?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea—I am not that familiar with the workings of that union.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever testify that Irving Potash was his second in command?

Mr. MATUSOW. I could have.

Senator DANIEL. Was that a true or false answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I could have said that—I do not know right now whether it is true or false—I don't just remember the organizational details of that union.

Senator DANIEL. Can you give us the names of other members of that union who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember any now.

Senator DANIEL. What about Ernie Parent?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall. I think he was a Communist; yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Was he an organizer for the fur workers union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember if he was a member.

Senator DANIEL. Was he employed by the union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember now, sir.

Senator DANIEL. In 1949 or late 1948, was he transferred from his activities in the union to full-time employment by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is possible, sir, but I don't recall right now.

Senator DANIEL. Did he become chairman of the Communist Party Youth in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. Was he ever chairman?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall that he was head of the Communist Party youth movement in New York County now, sir, that you brought it to mind.

Senator DANIEL. Did the union contribute financing to the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall whether they did or did not. Certain members of the union whom I knew contributed but whether the union officially did I do not know.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, if previously you have testified that the International Fur and Leather Workers Union did contribute financially to the Communist Party activities, was that a false statement or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. It could have been true; it could have been false, but it was some time ago when I had a better recollection than I do today, sir.

Senator DANIEL. In other words, what you might have testified previously, that would be more accurate than what your memory reveals today?

Mr. MATUSOW. On that specific subject; yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You do not deny having testified that the International Fur and Leather Workers Union did contribute financially to the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I cannot confirm or deny it. My recollections are too distant to—

Senator DANIEL. Did the Fur and Leather Workers Union participate in May Day parades?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is, yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. The other union which the Texas commission was concerned with was the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. Are you familiar with that union?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, may I ask a question of the Chair in relation to that? I'd like to cooperate.

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. About a week from yesterday or Monday, I have to appear in El Paso in a retrial motion for a member of that union whom I testified against, and my personal feeling—I might be wrong,

I haven't consulted counsel on it—would be that any testimony I offered today in relation to that matter on that union, or that individual, might in some way place his right to have a fair retrial motion in jeopardy, in that any statements I might make now would be maybe in violation of certain talks I have had with his counsel, which were in relation to what I specifically know about the matter, and that I feel that any discussion of that now, though I am not trying to avoid discussion of it, would have an effect in some way upon the atmosphere in El Paso, Tex., and the objectivity of the court in some way for a retrial motion whether it is granted or not—I do not know.

Senator DANIEL. Are you meaning to tell the committee that you fear the truthful answers that you might give to us here today concerning the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter and Clinton Jencks, might prejudice his right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, I submit—

Senator DANIEL. Is that what you say?

Mr. MATUSOW. The Chair draws an analogy very brief, sir. Prior—

Senator DANIEL. I just ask is that what you mean?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, it is not quite what I mean if I might continue very briefly. Prior to my original testimony before this committee in 1952, Mr. Roy Cohn told me that he had contacted members of this committee, and had an agreement from this committee that my testimony would not include any reference at that time to 17 Communist leaders who were going to be on trial where I was due to testify. So that any testimony I gave here would not in any way affect or be used in the trial in New York in which I was to testify. And I recall the committee was only too glad to help the Government and not have me testify on matters relating to those 17 individuals. What I am asking now is that now that I happen to be trying to help a man whom I wrongly accused and I am on the other side of the fence, so to speak, that the committee grant me or the counsel for Mr. Jencks the same right which this same committee granted Mr. Roy Cohn when I was a witness against Mr. Jencks and these Communist leaders.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Matusow, I am going to ask you these questions and we will see if any of them might come within the category that you have presented here. I do not believe that they will.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I appreciate your desire to help Mr. Jencks, but I do not believe that your truthful answers to these questions will have any effect whatever on the trial or rehearing of that case in El Paso.

Now the other union which the Texas commission was concerned with, repeating the question, was the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. Are you familiar with that union?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Any of the time you were a member of the Communist Party, did you have any contact with any of the higher officers or directors of that union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had contact with a member of that union.

Senator DANIEL. When?

Mr. MATUSOW. With officers on that union—an officer that I know of.

Senator DANIEL. Was that in 1950?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

Senator DANIEL. Where?

Mr. MATUSOW. It will have to be, we are getting—I mean I am talking about Mr. Jencks, sir, and I mean he is the only officer in the union whom I know personally.

Senator DANIEL. What Mr. Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. Clinton E. Jencks.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know him in 1950?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Where?

Mr. MATUSOW. You see now, sir, this again is going to be asked me next week and I am asking the committee if I might defer answering these questions until after I have offered testimony in the court of law.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, these questions will probably be asked you many, many times.

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand that.

Senator DANIEL. I would like you to go ahead with your answer, Where did you know Mr. Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, the responsibility is yours in relation to the motion in El Paso—I am not going to take it.

Senator DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and I think the record should show that the committee granted this request for the Government when I was to testify in a case for the Government, but now when I am testifying to correct an injustice, the committee insists that I answer questions, and will probably have some effect upon the fairness and the objectivity of the retrial motion for Mr. Jencks.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, all I am asking you to do is to tell the truth, that is it, as you see it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand.

Senator DANIEL. That you wish, or as you wish to present it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will gladly come back at the committee's request.

Senator DANIEL. The record will speak for itself. I have asked you to answer these questions.

(Senator McClellan left the committee room at this time.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I met Mr. Jencks in 1950 in San Cristobal, N. Mex.

Senator DANIEL. What was the occasion for your being in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was on vacation.

Senator DANIEL. At what place?

Mr. MATUSOW. The San Cristobal Valley Ranch in San Cristobal, N. Mex.—Taos County.

Senator DANIEL. Who operated the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. and Mrs. Vincent.

Senator DANIEL. Jenny Wells Vincent and her husband, Craig Vincent?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Where had you met them?

Mr. MATUSOW. In New York City.

Senator DANIEL. When?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1949, I believe.

Senator DANIEL. Did they invite you to their ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. They said—well, in effect, yes—they said if I am ever in New Mexico, I might stop by the ranch and say "Hello."

Senator DANIEL. You did on your way to California?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Senator DANIEL. It turned out that you stayed in Taos, N. Mex., on your trip to California?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Were you reporting to the FBI at the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you feel that on account of your reporting to the FBI the situation justified and warranted your staying at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I felt so at the time; yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Were you giving truthful reports to the FBI at the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I don't know what reports to the FBI contained.

Senator DANIEL. Well, to the best of your ability.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have any recollection of the reports. How can I answer a question when I have no recollection of those reports?

Senator DANIEL. You have no recollection whether you were giving the FBI truthful—

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection what was in the reports, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Let me ask you this: In all sincerity were you at that time intentionally falsifying reports to the FBI?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I cannot answer a question that I have no recollection of.

Senator DANIEL. I see. Now what officers of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union did you have contact with?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was on vacation at San Cristobal Ranch?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Clinton Jencks—Clinton E. Jencks, that is.

Senator DANIEL. That is the same Clinton Jencks who was under indictment in El Paso?

Mr. MATUSOW. He has been convicted.

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. He was later under indictment and then convicted in El Paso.

Mr. MATUSOW. Indicted April 1953, convicted in January 1954.

Senator WELKER. What is the status of his case now, if you know?

Mr. MATUSOW. A retrial motion is set for Monday, March 7.

Senator WELKER. Is he in jail?

Mr. MATUSOW. He is out on bail I presume now, sir.

Senator WELKER. You presume?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I don't know. I have not met Mr. Jencks. I believe I was told he was on bail.

Senator WELKER. If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, when did you last see Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was a witness against him in January 1954.

Senator WELKER. That is the last time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. When did you last see Craig Vincent or his wife?

Mr. MATUSOW. Gosh, I think I saw him at a distance in 1953, when I was riding in a car—I think I saw him walking down the street.

Senator WELKER. Have you corresponded with him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon?

Senator WELKER. Have you corresponded with him; Clinton Jencks—corresponded with either Craig Vincent or Jenny Wells Vincent?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir: not since 1950, not since I was there with the Communist Party.

Senator WELKER. You have spoken no word to either of them?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Or have you sent word to either of them by any means?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I believe after I signed the affidavit on behalf of Mr. Jencks I said to his attorney, "Say hello to Clint for me."

Senator WELKER. That is right. And where did you sign this affidavit?

Mr. MATUSOW. In New York City.

Mr. WELKER. In New York, and you said to his attorney—

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said "Tell him I hope that my admitting my false testimony does get him a new trial and one which can be a little more objective."

Senator WELKER. Who is his attorney now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Nathan Witt.

Senator WELKER. And would you tell us how the circumstances happened that you happened to meet and converse with Mr. Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. I wanted to see Mr. Witt and tell him that I wanted to give an affidavit to him in behalf of his client, Clinton Jencks.

Senator WELKER. One other question while we are on this subject matter of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union. When did you meet Mr. Travis?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall ever having met Mr. Travis.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever corresponded with him?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you been in Mexico recently?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mexico?

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. In January 1954. I made a burlesque house down there as a comedian; yes.

Senator WELKER. Did you see any of these people or their agents there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, they were all over the place. I did not converse with any of them, couldn't help but see them. They were all over the courtroom when I testified.

Senator WELKER. I think we must have misunderstood each other. I was speaking about while you were on your burlesque show.

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume some of them might have been in the audience but I don't recall seeing them or talking to anyone.

Senator WELKER. Thank you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was always with a member of the internal security—well, not always but most of the time I was with a member of the Texas Rangers in—Sergeant Vogel of the El Paso Police Department.

Senator DANIEL. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Jencks at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. When, in 1950?

Senator DANIEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Is that the only time you witnessed Jencks at this ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. At the ranch or in town itself.

Senator DANIEL. Did you have conversations with him there at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. On how many occasions did you discuss the activities of the Communist Party in the East?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you discuss the activities of the Communist Party in the East in relation to the Communist Party operating within the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you discuss the Communist Party at all with Mr. Clinton Jencks while you were on the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall any such discussion.

Senator DANIEL. While in town?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you here and now deny that you ever discussed the Communist Party—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. With Mr. Jencks in the State of New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. You bet, sir, I do deny that.

Senator DANIEL. Did he identify himself personally to you as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did Mr. Clinton Jencks tell you that they, his union, were contemplating calling a strike under the guise of obtaining more wages for the workers of the union in the copper industry but that the primary purpose of the strike was to deprive the Armed Forces of copper needed to carry on the conflict in Korea?

Mr. MATUSOW. Once again I will state, sir, no, he did not—about the third time in this hearing that I have stated that. It is in the record if you did not know it.

Senator DANIEL. You heard Mr. Jencks take the fifth amendment when you identified him and told this committee in Salt Lake City, Utah, that he did do that, that he did tell you that his union was going to slow down copper production, to harm our efforts in the Korean war; he was sitting there and heard you testify to that, didn't he?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir—

Senator DANIEL. Did he? Yes, or no.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will have to answer that question yes or no, but I would like to finish it and—

Senator DANIEL. I want a yes or no.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I then continue?

Senator DANIEL. Was he in the room and heard you testify that he had told you that his union was going to slow down copper production, in order to harm our efforts in the Korean war?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was in the room at that time.

Senator DANIEL. He was in the room?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You did so testify to this committee in Salt Lake City, Utah?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And he was asked whether or not he wished to deny the charge you made, was he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall him being asked that question, yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. What did he say when he was asked if he denied the charge that you made against him?

Mr. MATUSOW. He declined to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment which is his right.

Senator DANIEL. Yes. And he was asked if he knew you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. In that hearing?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And what did he say?

Mr. MATUSOW. So as not to waive his right on other questions relating to conversations with me, he had to, I believe, use the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now—

Senator EASTLAND. Did he or did he not use the fifth amendment?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said he used the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. What other officials of the union have visited at the San Cristobal Valley Ranch to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection.

Senator DANIEL. Was Maurice Travis—

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection—

Senator DANIEL. Or do you know a Maurice Travers or Travis?

Mr. MATUSOW. I know who he is.

Senator DANIEL. Well, who is he?

Mr. MATUSOW. Former officer in the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union.

Senator DANIEL. Did he hold office as the international secretary-treasurer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think that was his office, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever see him at the San Cristobal Valley Ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Now this Mrs. Jenny Vincent and husband Craig Vincent, is he the same Craig Vincent who has been chairman of the Progressive Party of Colorado?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know whether or not he worked in Washington during World War II?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't remember, sir; might have. It is possible that he did.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you previously testified under oath that he did, haven't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was sometime ago. My recollection might have been better then.

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you do not deny that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't deny nor do I confirm.

Senator DANIEL. Do you deny that Jenny Wells Vincent and Craig Vincent were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know them as Communists. I met him at a "hootnanny" once I believe I told somebody at a Communist Party meeting, bunch of people singing folksongs.

Senator DANIEL. That was false?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I testified before this committee to that thing I believe I said at a "hootnanny" or "whingding."

Senator DANIEL. Referring to Maurice Travers whom you mentioned before, or who I mentioned before, did you run into him in New York at any time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not to my recollection.

Senator DANIEL. You never did see Maurice Travers or Travis at Communist Party headquarters in New York?

Mr. MATUSOW. No recollection of it. I don't think I ever saw him.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking did you ever see him?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I don't think I ever did.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any recollection of testifying that you did see him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection of even testifying to that effect.

Senator DANIEL. But you know that you did not see him at Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I never did—I do not recall ever meeting the man.

Senator DANIEL. Then you do not know whether Maurice Travers or Travis was an active Communist at the time that you had contact with him?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember having contact with him. So how can I answer that question?

Senator DANIEL. While you were in the Communist Party, before you knew anything about the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, were you able to gather from the conversations with other members of the Communist Party there in New York, the attitude of the Communist Party generally toward the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

(Consultation between Mr. Matusow and counsel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. Give me that again, sir. I did not get quite all of that question. It just seemed to be a little topheavy.

Senator DANIEL. As a member of the Communist Party, were you able to gather anything from the party or any of its meetings concerning the attitude of the party toward the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. The language sounds awfully familiar.

Senator DANIEL. Well, just answer yes or no.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I at one time believed there were Communists in the smelter workers union if that is what you are driving at, sir.

I do not quite get the question, I think that is an answer to it.

Senator DANIEL. Did the Communist Party national committee in New York ever state to your knowledge that it considered the union Communist dominated?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I had no national committee on a meeting level or direction level. I don't believe they ever did so. They might have.

Senator DANIEL. You don't know whether that is true or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea. I was in a local Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. If you ever testified to that, would it be true or false?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea whether it is true or false.

Senator DANIEL. Then it would be false so far as your knowledge is concerned?

Mr. MATUSOW. Somebody might have shown me a statement issued by the national committee an hour before I testified and introduced a piece of evidence or something into a record in some hearing through me.

Senator DANIEL. Were you in Philadelphia in 1948?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I was.

Senator DANIEL. Did you know Mr. Henry Winston there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I did.

Senator DANIEL. He is one of the members of the Communist Party which was convicted under the Smith Act?

Mr. MATUSOW. National committee member under the Smith Act; yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. He was organizational secretary?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that was his title.

Senator DANIEL. You knew him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I did.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ride back to New York with him on a train from Philadelphia.

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Senator DANIEL. On that train, did he tell you anything about the need for young Communists, to go into the basic industries, labor unions?

Mr. MATUSOW. He said get out into, get out of the white-collar jobs in New York and get off their intellectual haunches or something and get out into basic industry and learn what makes life click.

Senator DANIEL. This Harry Winston?

Mr. MATUSOW. Henry Winston.

Senator DANIEL. Henry Winston, this guy was—what was his position in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was on the national committee. I forgot his exact title.

Senator DANIEL. Where did he tell you to go to get in these key basic industries?

Mr. MATUSOW. Heck, he just said, go out and get working in industry and get out of the schools and get out, he did not specify any specific place that I recall. Industry in every one of the United States except maybe Nevada.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever read any articles in the Daily Worker favorable to the Mine, Mill, Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is possible, I recall, I believe.

Senator DANIEL. Then you have?

Mr. MATUSOW. One specifically, maybe it was Mine, Mill Union. Yes, sir, it was an article in the Daily Worker that told how some members of the United Steel Workers had gone into a radio station in Birmingham, Ala., and beat up the organization secretary of the Mine, Mill Union and taken his eye out—Mr. Travis—during a union fight.

After the union was expelled from the CIO, it went into the radio station and beat him up and knocked his eye out and he has been seen, that is a favorable story to it.

Senator DANIEL. Is it true that in 1953 that you were a member of several trade unions?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't know how many, I guess I was a member of a few.

Senator DANIEL. Did you belong to the American Newspaper Guild of the CIO?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I left that union sometime I think in 1952 or 1953.

Senator DANIEL. Then you were not a member?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I was, might have been a member in 1953. I do not recall the date that I no longer kept my membership.

Senator DANIEL. Take a moment to refresh your memory.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I did not give much thought to it. I haven't been in the newspaper business for awhile. And I stopped paying dues in the union and I don't recall when I received notice that I had been dropped from the rolls of that union.

Senator DANIEL. I see.

Mr. MATUSOW. But I had been a member of local 3, American Newspaper Guild, CIO.

Senator DANIEL. Do you not remember you were a member?

Mr. MATUSOW. In 1953 I was also a member of the American Guild of Variety Artists, American Federation of Television and Radio Artists.

Senator DANIEL. You did belong to the American Federation of Radio and Television Artists in 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

American Guild of Variety Artists.

Senator DANIEL. All right. What other unions did you belong to?

Mr. MATUSOW. Couple of others I cannot think of their names right now.

Theatrical unions, I believe.

Senator DANIEL. Did you seek employment with the Progressive Party when it was supporting Mr. Henry Wallace?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't recall seeking employment. I recall working with the Progressive Party.

Senator DANIEL. How did you come to work with the Progressive Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I supported Henry Wallace for President in 1948, that is how I came to work for them.

Senator DANIEL. Is it true that you sought to work with the Progressive Party on instruction from the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't know if I did or didn't. It is possible. It is possible, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, Mr. Matusow——

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, would you like for me to refresh your memory?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I think I ought to answer the questions if you ask me. If you have something that you think might refresh my memory, be glad to see it.

Senator DANIEL. You have previously testified that you worked with the Progressive Party on instructions from the Communist Party, have you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I said a lot of things.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am asking you, was it true?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you will not deny that you were instructed by the Communist Party to work with the Progressive Party for the election of Henry Wallace for President?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, let me say now that when, no I mean in answer to that question.

Senator DANIEL. That is what I want, an answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is my recollection when I return to, from El Paso next week, and I will be glad to come back to this committee and hold certain questions that you are asking me, that I have no recollection of now, I will answer those questions to the best of my ability with a much clearer recollection, because I will have time to check into the answers.

Senator DANIEL. You have missed the question. I am simply asking you now whether or not you are denying—

Mr. MATUSOW. I neither deny nor confirm.

Senator DANIEL. I don't see how you can know what the answer is without—

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me.

Senator DANIEL. Without being clear as to the question. Now the question is: At this time whether or not you are denying under oath that you were instructed by the Communist Party to support the Progressive Party, to work with the Progressive Party in support of Henry Wallace for President?

Mr. MATUSOW. I can't confirm or deny it. I don't have any recollection.

Senator DANIEL. That is all I asked.

Mr. MATUSOW. That's all.

Senator DANIEL. Were you working for People's Songs at the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. It was a cultural organization and they were handling most of the publicity for the Progressive Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. They were doing some publicity and some public relations for the Progressive Party.

Senator DANIEL. Wherever Wallace would go they would stage singing sessions, is that true?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is, they would have a lot of folk singers sing old American traditional songs; yes, sir.

Square dances, and such—even have a Progressive Party square dance which was quite good.

Senator DANIEL. When you arrived at San Cristobal Valley Ranch, did you see there a girl who was secretary to one of the delegates or one of the Czechoslovakian—a Czechoslovakian citizen here with a diplomatic passport, and secretary to one of the delegates to the United Nations at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator DANIEL. What was her name?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall her name.

Senator DANIEL. Was there anything strange to you that a Czechoslovakian citizen should find her way to that ranch in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I thought it was strange at the time but not necessarily strange.

Senator DANIEL. The ranch—

Mr. MATUSOW. It was a vacation resort.

Senator DANIEL. The ranch was not advertised in the East; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge. It could have been, though.

Senator DANIEL. The Communist Party did not advertise it or mention it in New York; did it?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I have stated I don't recall the Communist Party advertising it. Which might mean it was not a Communist Party ranch.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you might be surprised to know you have also stated that the Communist Party did not advertise it or mention it in New York, it was almost an unknown ranch; was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Among the Communist Party members.

Senator DANIEL. That is right between the first or second year of operation, was the year you were there, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; but I believe it was advertised in the Audubon magazine or some such nature lover's magazine.

Senator DANIEL. Did you think it was kind of strange that this Czechoslovakian girl was out there on the ranch—on a vacation or not, did you ever think it was?

Mr. MATUSOW. Of course I think it was strange.

Senator DANIEL. How do you think she got there?

Mr. MATUSOW. She told me that she flew out to Denver and came down on a bus.

Senator DANIEL. Didn't she also tell you that she got the information through Communist Czechs in this country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what I said. You know, I was good at making up stories.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking you for the truth. Did she tell you that she got the information as to this ranch—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall what she said.

Senator DANIEL. How did you know what I was going to say.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry, I thought you finished your question.

Senator DANIEL. Did she tell you that she got the information as to this ranch, and the sponsorship of the ranch from members of the Communist Party in this country?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know, sir, what she said. I do not remember.

Senator DANIEL. Would you swear now she did not tell you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection of that one way or another. I am making a note of these questions I will dig into them and I believe I can refresh my recollection when I return from El Paso, Tex.

Senator DANIEL. Do you mean to say that your purpose in—

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I will have a chance to read my testimony.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking the questions. I am just wondering, is there any method in this failing to remember the answer to these questions?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; you see, I will have a chance to read certain testimony I gave this committee and check various and sundry inci-

dents through newspapers and reports of it, and go into memory and have a little time to think about it.

You are throwing things at me, like that, and I just can't think about it right, to get them right.

Senator DANIEL. This Vincent Ranch, did they welcome non-Communists there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Of course they did.

Senator DANIEL. They did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; of course they did.

Senator DANIEL. Did they have Communist Party meetings there at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never saw any.

Senator DANIEL. Did you discuss the ANMA organizations at the ranch? What is that?

Mr. MATUSOW. American association or something, American National Mexican Association or some such name.

Senator DANIEL. Was that a Communist-dominated organization?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever discuss that with Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, on ANMA.

Senator DANIEL. Did he make a speech on the organization there at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. On ANMA?

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall any speech of that nature.

Senator DANIEL. Did they have the whole Communist Party there on the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not that I know of.

Senator DANIEL. Now, Mr. Jencks.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know of any.

Senator DANIEL. You were reporting to the FBI during this time, were you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know what I reported to at that time.

Senator DANIEL. I am asking what they were holding at the ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know.

Senator DANIEL. You mean you were at the ranch reporting to the FBI as to what was going on there with respect to the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I was in Taos, not at the ranch reporting to the FBI. Let's get the record straight on that.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you did report what went on at the ranch after you got back to Taos?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall reporting license plate numbers of a few cars at one time, but I don't recall what else went in the reports.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever hear the Communist Party mentioned at the Vincent Ranch?

Mr. MATUSOW. I mentioned it once to somebody. This fellow whose name I don't remember, who the FBI agent told me was a State organizer of the New Mexico Communist Party.

Senator DANIEL. Did you ever hear it mentioned by any other human being there at the ranch while you were there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall it.

Senator DANIEL. You don't?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have, but I don't recall.

Senator DANIEL. You will not swear that Clinton Jencks did not speak to you about the Communist Party and its plans, would you?

Mr. MATUSOW. He did not talk to me about the Communist Party; that was a fabrication.

Senator DANIEL. You know that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I do.

Senator DANIEL. He was one of your best friends at the ranch, was he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; he was, sir.

Senator DANIEL. But you do not recall whether anyone else mentioned the Communist Party or not; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was out there for a vacation, not for a political rally.

Senator DANIEL. The fact that you were reporting to the FBI on what was going on did not warrant you in staying there as long as you did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, get out in those mountains and they kind of attract—

Senator DANIEL. That was not my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is why I stayed there, I like the mountains out there. I went to art school.

Senator DANIEL. You did not stay there for any other information that you could get for the FBI?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, that was secondary. Let's be—

Senator DANIEL. First or secondary, did you stay there for the information you could get for the FBI, even though it was a secondary reason?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't go to the ranch to get information for the FBI. I went on a vacation.

Senator DANIEL. I did not ask you why you went there. Let us get the question straight. Did you stay there as long as you did, for the purpose of getting information for the FBI even though it was a secondary purpose?

Answer yes or no.

Mr. MATUSOW. As a secondary purpose, sir, yes.

Senator DANIEL. You did?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. All right. Did you make any inquiries as to what was going on there with respect to the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, not that I recall.

Senator DANIEL. In other words, you would have this committee believe that you did stay there for the secondary purpose of getting any information you could about what the Communist Party was doing at that ranch and yet you never made an inquiry at all as to what the party was doing, is that what you want us to believe?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is the way you operate when you are getting information, you don't make inquiries, you let the information come to you, if it is there.

Senator DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. Otherwise you would become an information provocateur which was what I was not.

Senator DANIEL. Did any information come to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Are you testifying now that none did come to you with respect to Communist schools and Communist organizations and the purposes of the Jencks union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollections of that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all.

(Consultation between counsel and Mr. Matusow.)

Senator EASTLAND (presiding). Mr. Matusow, when did you first talk to Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall the date. It was the week that his book was published; the book I Protest, the book protesting the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Senator EASTLAND. I want to read——

Mr. MATUSOW. It was in the spring as I recall—excuse me—of 1954.

Senator EASTLAND. In the spring of 1954. I wanted to read to you a statement that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 7, last year and ask you if this statement is true or false:

Harvey Matusow, whom he described—

now this is quoting Bishop Oxnam.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND (reading) :

as a former investigator for Senator McCarthy, sought him out twice, the Bishop said, to say that he had had a religious experience and wished some way to undo all of the lies I have told about him—

quoting you.

"Still in an hour such as this," Bishop Oxnam said, "what we need is the unbiased approach and the undaunted spirit to return to whatsoever things are true."

Now, did you seek out Bishop Oxnam and tell him that you had lied about a great many people?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know if I would say I sought him out, sir. But I did meet Bishop Oxnam and I did tell him that I had made false accusations against a number of people; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Where did you meet Bishop Oxnam?

Mr. MATUSOW. In New York. And here in Washington.

Senator EASTLAND. New York and here in Washington?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Who were these people that you told Bishop Oxnam that you had lied about?

Mr. MATUSOW. Bishop Oxnam was one. Senator Mansfield, Senator Jackson, made accusations against many radio and television, newspaper people like Marquis Childs, Elmer Davis, Drew Pearson, New York Post, the New York Times, Time magazine, attacked Senator Lehman, Senator Humphrey, attacked Senator Douglas in speeches.

I had attacked the Democratic Party.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, now did that include Mr. Clinton Jencks?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall if I spelled out every name.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, did you include now in those lists your testimony against people who were convicted in the courts?

Mr. MATUSOW. Might have—might not have, sir. I was not going into specific details with Bishop Oxnam at all times.

We were talking in general, much of our conversation had to do with his reading some of my poetry—our discussing poetry or discussing other matters besides testimony.

Senator EASTLAND. After that you were subpoenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee; were you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. You came to Washington and testified?

Mr. MATUSOW. June 12 to June 14; was it not?

Senator EASTLAND. July 14, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. July 12 then—it was Bastile Day—I should have remembered.

Senator EASTLAND. Were you placed under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I was.

Senator EASTLAND. I want to ask you if this testimony is accurate:

Mr. SCHERER. If the Bishop was correctly reported by the newspapers, did he tell the truth?

Mr. MATUSOW—

this was your answer:

If he was correctly reported by the newspapers the bishop is a dishonest man.

Was that your answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, for good reasons, too.

Senator EASTLAND. Was the bishop a dishonest man?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I believe that a conversation with Bishop Oxnam or any member of the clergy was privileged and should not be reported to the public and I believe his reporting that conversation is a dishonest act and a violation of his position. That is why I called him a dishonest man.

Senator WELKER. Right on that subject matter, might I have a question?

And you so wrote that in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did.

Senator WELKER. Page 263.

Mr. MATUSOW. It couldn't be—the book only has 256 pages.

Senator WELKER. Maybe I am incorrect—232.

Mr. MATUSOW. 232. It is very possible, may I check it? I believe it says something like I was not going to take the rap for anybody.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Matusow, now the reason that you said Bishop Oxnam was dishonest was because he released testimony you thought was privileged; is that your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, yes, sir, because he had discussed in public something which was discussed with him and was privileged.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir. Now you did tell him, sir, you had lied about all of these people?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe I used the term "lied" but in substance I said he had lied; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. I want to ask you this:

While under oath, Tavenner asked you this question:

You have looked over your former testimony, and studied it this morning; have you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I have not sir. Once I gave the testimony it was given and it was fact and fact does not lose anything in time.

Mr. CLARDY. You have had a copy of the transcript this morning of the report.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I have not seen it.

Mr. CLARDY. I thought you had.

Mr. MATUSOW. There is no necessity for it, I don't think, nothing that I have said in that testimony or in the 25 or 30 times subsequent to that before various committees and court proceedings, I have contradicted in any way the testimony I have given.

Was that your testimony, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my testimony, yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Last July, did this occur?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is what the committee wants to inquire as to whether or not any part of the testimony you have given the committee is in error, or any statement in it which is false.

And Mr. Matusow, you answered, "No."

You so testified and under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, that is my testimony.

Senator EASTLAND. Now did this occur:

Mr. MATUSOW. When I first testified before this committee, in February 1952, I told the truth, in fact I do not believe there is any editorial or any comment other than facts in that testimony the way it was prepared and given. Sometimes I have with the exception of today related all my testimony to the specific facts, but in February 1952, I did not quite appreciate or realize the full scope of what the testimony would mean. I was a young veteran, just got out of the Air Force, in fact, I think I was still in the Air Force the first day I testified in executive session and it did not quite penetrate. It was something new. My name was in the headlines and I did not appreciate all that was going on around me. It was happening too quick. In the past few months, I have had time to reflect. The testimony is still there. Only now it has more stability to it which it did not have 2 years ago. There are no lies.

Was that your testimony, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. That was my testimony, sir; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Is it your testimony now that you were lying under oath the 12th day of July when you gave that testimony to the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is my testimony; I was not prepared to do what I am doing now because I hadn't found the courage of conviction—

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. On July 12 that I have now.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, I say, that testimony which you gave in July last year, you now say is a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. Partly so, partly not so, sir. You read a lot of stuff there, some material there is true, when I said I first—

Senator EASTLAND. Reading your testimony—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, you would have to break it down. For instance, the stuff you just read, when you said when I first testified I did not realize what I was doing, the instability, that is very true, sir. There was instability. And I didn't realize the damage, the irresponsible damage that would be and the havoc wrought because of my testimony throughout the United States.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Of innocent people.

Senator EASTLAND. Wait just a minute now, Mr. Matusow, but you said—you said that, you said now "I have had time to reflect."

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator EASTLAND. Now there is more stability to it, which it did not have 2 years ago.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think that proves it out.

Senator EASTLAND. You said that, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Then you said there are no lies.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, when I said there are no lies, I was lying.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes. Now you had been to Bishop Oxnam.

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me.

Senator EASTLAND. You had been to Bishop Oxnam.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, and—

Senator EASTLAND. And you had told Bishop Oxnam that you were lying about all of these people?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I had told him I had lied about many people.

Senator EASTLAND. When called before the committee and placed under oath you affirmed all of your previous testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I was afraid of the committee that day.

Senator EASTLAND. And testified that there had never been a lie in the 25 times you had appeared before committees and in court.

Mr. MATUSOW. The committee should have known better than to accept it.

Senator EASTLAND. All right, sir.

I am getting your testimony. Now did this happen:

Mr. SCHERER. When you say "stability" do you mean it has been confirmed since that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

And I have been able to reflect from my past now, instead of living in it. I was not doing what the Communist Party claims the witness does before the committees, indiscriminately dropping names as they say.

Was that your testimony, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. That you were not indiscriminately—you meant that you were not indiscriminately smearing people in your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I think the record on that ought to show that I had not slept for almost 2 nights when I testified that day and I was a little incoherent in relation to questions that were asked and answers given.

Senator EASTLAND. Does that mean a man will lie, he is more prone to lie when he has not had a night's sleep?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I state now and state in my book if I had had a night's sleep before I testified I might have come out and said I lied. I was too tired to fight with anybody that day.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir; do you know Captain Bundy?

Mr. MATUSOW. Bundy? Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. He is a member of the antisubversive committee of the American Legion, is he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I believe he is a Methodist that goes around attacking Bishop Oxnam, that he comes from Illinois, Wheaton.

Senator EASTLAND. Wheaton, Ill.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, Wheaton, Ill.; he is Edgar Bundy, I believe it is.

Senator EASTLAND. State whether or not you talked to Captain Bundy that morning before you gave your testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. In a near coma, shall we say, or sleepy, I believe I said to Captain Bundy, you know, "Just let me alone, I know what I am doing, and it will all get out in the wash." And he, Captain Bundy said to me, he said, "I have gone around the country vouching for you at this meeting and that meeting."

Captain Bundy by the way was at that meeting in Libertyville where I attacked Bishop Oxnam and he complimented me on my attacks on the bishop on October 5.

Senator EASTLAND. I tell you now that Captain Bundy denies any such thing.

Mr. MATUSOW. I imagine so—he is embarrassed, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. I want you to answer my question.

Did you tell Captain Bundy that morning that if Bishop Oxnam said in the newspapers that you had ever lied about any man that Bishop Oxnam himself was a liar?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that state of mind, that morning, sir, I might have said—I have no recollection.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection.

Senator EASTLAND. You have no recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. My only recollection is I was not able to fight with anybody that day, Captain Bundy or anyone else.

Senator EASTLAND. Your answer is that you had no recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. All right, sir.

Now, was this your answer:

Before the committee contacted me, I had spent approximately 3 months in preparing an autobiography of sorts, a complete chronological list of events of my activities in the Communist Party, and in front groups, starting in 1946, when I joined the American Youth for Democracy and going back further to my service in World War II in the Army, when I was first contacted by the Communists. I prepared this chronological list of events of my activities and I believe that it took about six drafts. I think the committee has received two of them. I gave Mr. Appel the next to the last draft of this autobiography which I went over and over and over to make sure that things were not in error.

(Consultation between committee members.)

Senator EASTLAND. Was that your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, it was.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, now, had you lied in that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I meant what I said, to be objective.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer my question, please.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I haven't read that report. I don't know.

Senator EASTLAND. You don't know whether you told a lie or whether it was true?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. These are things that I have not looked at in a long time.

Senator EASTLAND. What was the date of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. October something 1951, September 1951.

Senator EASTLAND. Had you at great care fixed up a paper, in chronological order, of all of the events and your associations in the Communist Party and in front groups?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I had used some care and it had a lot of events but a lot of it was editorial on my part and put a lot of what you might say "window dressing" in it.

Senator EASTLAND. You gave it to the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I did; gave it to the Air Force and to the committee.

Senator EASTLAND. And you swore in July of last year that that statement was correct and that there were no errors in it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall, but if I swore to it, I swore to it but—

Senator EASTLAND. Did you swear to it, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. Knowing that report, I must have really been out of my head to swear to that report because there was no research that went into it other than my memory.

Senator EASTLAND. You did not swear to the report, Mr. Matusow, you took an oath in that committee to tell the truth.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I did.

Senator EASTLAND. And you stated in your testimony, that it was true. Now I am asking you if your testimony then was true or false in that respect?

Mr. MATUSOW. The testimony is correct but parts of the testimony are false, and in that respect partly false and partly true. I have very little recollection of the whole matter.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, and counsel informs me that he has a copy of that document. I think, Mr. Matusow, you should identify it.

Mr. MATUSOW. There were two copies—

Senator EASTLAND. All right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Of that document.

Senator EASTLAND. You can identify which copy it was.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. And then later, but not now, I want you to point out the things that were true and the things that were false in the document.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, before counsel brings that document to me, to my knowledge—that document is going to be used, I believe, next Monday in the court proceeding in a retrial motion for Mr. Clinton E. Jencks, in El Paso, Tex., and because of that I request that the committee defer any action in relation to that document at all until such time.

Senator EASTLAND. No, no, sir; no, no, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. I want you to identify the document first and then we will discuss it.

(Document handed him by Mr. Sourwine.)

Mr. MATUSOW. I have to decline any answers in relation to this document on the grounds of the protection of the fifth amendment afforded me.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I volunteer a statement?

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. This document, Mr. Chairman, came into my possession from the official possession of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It has been constantly in my possession since that time. I offer it for this record as the document the witness has declined to identify.

Senator EASTLAND. It will go in the record. It will be made a part of the record. You can release copies of that to the press.

(The document was marked "Exhibit No. 24" and appears below:)

## EXHIBIT No. 24

october 19 1951

harvey marshall matusow

I Harvey Marshall Matusow, born in the city of new York, Bronx County, on the 3rd of October 1926. I attended P. S. 70, 80, and 104 in the Bronx New York, and am a graduate of William Howard Taft High School bronx NY (fall 1944) I have been a non-matriculating student at the downtown school of business on the College Of The City Of New York. My first employment was as a delivery boy for the local grocer, tailor, and laundry, during the years I attended High School I worked as a nite clerk in a cigar store on 161st Street & Morris Avenue in the Bronx New York. My last Year of High School I worked for Jr. Deb Clothing on 38th Street & Seventh Ave NYC, and Deiner & Dorskin Advertising Agency, 42nd Street & Times Sq. NYC . . . On the 1st of November 1943 I enlisted in the Army Air Force Reserve, and in October of 1944, on my 18th Birthday I vol. for active duty, not with the Air Force, but with the Ground Forces . . . I was called to active duty on the 31st of October 1944, processed at fort Dix New Jersey, and then sent to Camp Blanding Fla. for Basic Training as a rifleman in the United States Infantry.

After completion of basic training, I was sent overseas to the European Theatre of Operations, where during the closing weeks of the war I joined the 106th Infantry Division, 3rd Infantry Rgt.; 424th Inf.; and the 422nd Inf. I was then transferred to the 118th Infantry Regt near Dijon France. While with the 118th I was placed on Detached Service at Biarritz American University, Biarritz France, where I studied Pol. Science, American History, and Phys. I.; I also while attending school there worked in the Public Relations Office of the University. Upon the completion of school I returned to the 118th Infantry which had then moved to Chalons France. My next unit was a recruit reception center in Europe, "Camp Roosevelt" at Soissons France. I was assigned to that Unit for about 5 months and then transferred to Hq Cont. Base Section in Bad Nauheim Germany where I worked in the Re Deployment Section of the Adj. Generals Dept. I returned to the United States on the 12th of July 1946, and was discharged on the 3rd of August 1946. I remained in the Reserve (Army, Adj Gen Dept) until August 1949, at which time I received my Discharge.

In March of 1947 I went to work for Grey Advertising Agency on west 32d Street NYC. I worked there until Sept or Oct 1947. I next did some free lance work in the theater, out of the office of Noel Wesley, 234 West 44th Street. In May 1948 I went to work at the Jefferson Book Shop at the Jefferson School in New York, and in July and August of that year managed the Bookshop at their Summer Camp, Camp Sherwood, in Hurleyville, New York. In Sept. of 1948 I went to work for Peoples Songs Inc. at 126 West 21st Street, NYC, running Peoples Songs Music Center. I worked there until the Organization folded in Feb or March of 1949. I then held part time job with the Communist Party, New York County Office, at 35 East 12th Street, and also during the period from Jan 1 1949 to July 1949, I for one week held a job in a printing shop under UOPWA contract, and worked for the Jefferson School, getting material for the Jefferson School Bazaar held in the Spring of 1949 . . . . July and August 1949 I worked for Wholesale Book Corp, 48 East 13th Street (Rear Ent. to CP National Hq.) at Camp Unity, Wingdale NY as manager of the Unity Bookshop. In sept of 1949 I worked in the Workers Bookshop, 48 East 13th Street, and worked there until late November 1949.

My next job was on a special promotion for the Amsterdam News in NYC. In May 1950 I worked for Bon Air Conditioning Corp., Long Island City, NY, as an air conditioning salesman. In July 1950 I left New York, intending to go to Los Angeles, Calif., with the prospects of a job selling Air Conditioning; however, I never reached there, for when I got to Taos, New Mexico, I stayed. In Taos I attended the Taos Valley Art School under the GI Bill of Rights, worked as a nite clerk in the Taos Inn, and drove a cab, as well as doing many odd jobs to make a living. In late November 1950 I returned to New York for a brief visit; however, before leaving Taos I enlisted in the Air Force Reserve. I stayed in New York until the 20th of January 1951, when I returned to New Mexico where I applied for and received active duty in the United States Air Force. Before recall I went to Albuquerque and for about a week drove a

Checker Cab there. I was recalled at Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, on the 21st of February 1951. I was in the 2224th Personnel Processing Sq. In the early part of May I was transferred to the 3069th Support Sq. at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, and while there was in the 1125th Field Activities Group, the 7300th Material Control Gp, and the 2750th Air Base Wing.

I am at present a S/Sgt in the Air Force in the 2750th Air Base Wing working in the Personal Affairs Office of Wright Patterson AFB, Dayton Ohio. My permanent Home address is 1491 Macombs Road Bronx 52 New York. Both of my parents, Herman J. Matusow, and Sylvia K. Matusow are living, and reside at the above mentioned address. My Father is a merchant and has a cigar stand in the Masonic Building in New York City, and my mother is a housewife. I have no living brothers or sisters, I had one Brother, Sgt Daniel B. Matusow 12121523 Killed in Action United States Air Force over Germany on the 10th of Sept 1944.

I have lived at 1575 Townsend Avenue Bx Ny, 1504 Morris Avenue Bx NY 1566 Macombs Rd Bx, NY, 1568 Macombs Rd Bronx NY, 1491 Macombs Rd Bronx NY, 24 West 18th Street NYC, 167 East 2nd Street NY City, 167 West 60th Street NYC, and General Delivery Taos New Mexico.

How I became interested in the Communist Party, and the Party of me is a story that has happened many times in this country, to both people from a large city, and those from small industrial towns. I joined the party in November or October of 1947 after having been in the AYD for about one year, but to me the as I see it now, my story begins a long time before 1946 . . .

Before my entry on Active military service in 1944 I had attended high school and held a few part time jobs. I lived in the same neighborhood all my life, and my circle of friends were almost never changing. Most of them I had known for 10 years or more. I had a normal family life, with the kinds of problems that most children have, not wanting to do my homework, looking for an excuse to stay away from school, and in fact a truant officer once caught me playing hookey from school. I had one big brother, who was like all big brothers should be, kind friendly, and in general looked after me when I needed looking after. My parents were home a great deal of the time, and I had plenty of time to be with them, I'd go places with them, and in general I'd say there was nothing that could be considered a major problem at home in my up bringing.

When it came to playing baseball, football, or any other sport, I was just another average guy, I wasn't left out of the games and in some cases I was team Capt. I guess I got my full of what most kids want. I lived in the shadow of the House that Ruth Built, and on about a dozen occasions I saw Ruth Playing in a Yankee Uniform. Like Tom Sawyer, or Huck Fin I loved adventure. I loved hiking in the woods of Bronx Park, or up in Westchester County, I wanted to move and see things. I wanted to do things that were different. I just wasn't content to sit home and listen to the radio, or stand on a street corner and talk about doing something, I wanted to do it . . . . Before my entry into the army there was little I could do about "doing something about it", but after my discharge things changed, I'd been all over Europe, met a lot of people. I felt that the kind of life I had been living in the Pre War Years, and the one I saw in store for me on Macombe Rd after the war, one that I didn't like. I just couldn't see standing on a street corner and saying "lets do something" and someone else saying "ya, but what?"

Shoot a game of Pool, a couple of lines of bowling, mabe go to a movie, or a dance, or what was usualy the case, a bull session or a card game. As I look at it now there was nothing wrong with it, but I had just finished a hitch in the Army and thaths all there was to do, finding it in civilian life didn't appeal to me. I liked good music, a stage show, play a game of chess, things that I didn't find with my old friends, except the ones that were in the Party or AYD. . . . . I know now that the things I liked to do could be done without the party, but then it was the party that first came across with it. . I had never been really interested in politics, the first and only political act was in 1936, during the presidential camp. A group of about 10 kids were standing a a street corner, I was one of them. A man came along and offered us \$10.00 if we'd do something for him. All he wanted us to do was go down to Madison Sq. Garden, and carry some Roosevelt-Garner posters around inside the garden. Being Kids, and loving the looks of \$10.00 we accepted. We thought nothing of it, and neither would the peoples at the Madison Sq Garden, except that it was a Repb. Rally for Landon. . . . .

My first contact with the communist Party was when I was in the Service in Europe. I don't remember there names, but there were two Sgts in My

outfit (Camp Roosevelt) who admitted to me being members of the Communist Party. We used to have bull sessions about anything from baseball to the world situation. On weekends we would go to Paris, and there I was introduced to a number of French Party Members who were good friends of the guys in my outfit. . . . I didn't have any feeling about them in the way of hate or love. . . . In fact at the time I respected them for they were all active in the underground movement, and at the time anybody who took up arms against Hitler was okay in my book. I would say now that the seeds for my future activity in the Party were laid on those weekend visits to Paris. I also know of some party activity that took Place in Biarritz, where some American Party Members made contact with the French Party in Biarritz. The GI's contacted all the men that they could and bought all the small arms that could be purchased, they in turn gave them to the French Party who sent them through the underground to Spain, and the Communist Forces who were at the time still active in fighting France. Later in 1948 I met a former GI named George who had been at Biarritz at the time I was there, he also admitted knowing about the arms smuggling. All that I can recall about George was that he was a member of the Party and Nature Friends, in the Army and attended the First Class at Biarritz. . . .

When I got back to the states and was discharged I was not looking for a political party, but when I found many of my childhood friends had joined the left wing movement I was not surprised. One in particular, Julie Sheik. I had known him for about ten years, he was a good friend of my brothers, and had been to the house many time, played pinochle with me and my brother. We had a great many interests, he liked to play chess, go to concert, or theatre. I used to go to his home and listen to his records, Jazz and Classical, and folk. Julie had on many occasions asked me to attend to meetings of Club Roosevelt of the AYD, (which met at the Park Plaza Building, Tremont and University Ave's in the Bronx NY.) I had no particular interest in going and promised that someday I would attend, not really intending to. . . . One Saturday nite I was shooting the bull with a friend of mine, Irwin Crossack, when Julie came along.

"Have you anything to do?" He asked. We didn't and told him so. He then asked us if we would like to go to a party given by a friend of his on Gun Hill Rd in the Bronx. As I said, having nothing better to do we accepted. The party turned out to be an AYD affair given by the Joe Hill Club of the Bronx AYD. Most of the members of club Roosevelt were there, they just as we had done paid one buck to get in. As I later found out the party and its front groups don't have Saturday or any other nite parties that are not of the paying variety. . . . They preach against God and against all Church, because as they say "The Church Robs you, and takes all you have, collections etc." but most party members who are telling you this usually have there hand in your money pocket at the time. . . . In spite of my paying I had a good time that nite, and when it was over I found myself relaxed for the first time in months. I liked most of the people I had met there and they seemed to like me. For the most part they were the kind of people I wanted to have for friends, not because of their politics, but rather I seemed to see something in the group that I hadn't known before in Civilian life. It was sort of like an Army unit, everybody had the feeling that he and she belonged, part of something working together and enjoying it. They sang songs, ones that I had never heard before. All told they were, as I thought then, fighting for the things that I wanted and having fun doing it.

I was given some literature to read about UMT and saving OPA and invited to attend the Next Meeting of Club Roosevelt, and invitation which I accepted. . . . The following Friday, good to my word, at 8 o'clock, was in the Park Plaza Building about to enter the club room of Club Roosevelt AYD. It was a cool October Day in 1946. . . . I received a warm welcome. . . Some of the people there were Julie Sheik, Lee Scharf, Harry Kramer, Gwynnith Grobin, Zach, Raul Hesselroth, Marion Goldberg, Bernie Lippman, Dave Yellen, Turk, Bob Newirth Ned Fine, Carroll Pheiffer, and Rhoda. . . There were others but at the time I can't remember there names. . . All told there were about 25 people present, of which about 10 were members of the party. . . The subject of the meeting was the fight against UMT, it was given in a report by Dave Yellen. Action of the Meeting was to have a petition campi. in the neighborhood, and writing letters and cards to members of congress. . . . this was accomplished by setting up of tables in the community with printed cards for the people to sign. . . . Dave Yellen sold me a sub to the worker at that meeting. . . There

was a dance after the meeting, and at about 11 o'clock we ajonned to the local Ice Cream parlor where Julie and others kept up there attempt to recruit me, which they did Before the meeting was over . . . .

From November 1946 to March 1947 my main activity was with Club Roosevelt. Altho during this period I had attended a few meeting of the Downtown CCNY branch of AYD, helped them in a few petition camp, tho at this time I don't remember who I worked with. . . During this period my only contact with the party was my weekly copy of the Sunday Worker. The paper seemed harmless enough to me, and I frankly didn't pay to much attention to it. However I did at the suggestion of Julie and Lee use it in preparing a club educational on the draft that I was to give, and during that period I was asked questions dealing with the worker buy party members in the club. . . The highest position held in the club was that of educational director, and that was attained in February 1947. My job was to work with the ed committee, of which I was the only non communist (Julie, Bernie Lippman, Rhoda) and help in the preperation of weekly educationals. I was also in charge of te club library. It contained a number of books that were published by International Publishers. Wm Fosters "New Europe" dead of Cant "Soviet Power" as well as many communist Part Phamp.

I was also on the social committee of the club, we planned parties twice a month, one held in the Club Hq, and the other at someones Home. . . . Usually ed Fines, or Julies, or Bob Newirth's. . . . The parties held in the Club Hq. were usually quite dull, there main reason was to get new reeruits, no liquor or beer, and all on the up and up, but when they got to someones home "All Hell Broke Lose" Julie was the head of a click that never said d c, their love making was open, their drinking wouldn't and their overall actions would not have been tolerated at a low dive in any town in the country. I wouldn't say that all t e members of the Club took part in the activities, but a great many did. . . . On one occasion the Janitor of the building found Turk smooking a reefer, it caused a great deal of discussion in the club, for because of it we almost lost our club room, however nothing ever came of it, and Turk kept on using "Dope". . . . . When evr the Jefferson School and the School of Jewish Stud es had reegistration Lee Scharf would come to meetings and give pep talks about the redusred rates for AYD Members, and how they were setting up a Br nx Anex of the Schools, which were held at the AYD Hq on Southern Blvd. . . . . On the question of UMT the club was devided, but with constant pressure the Party forces who were well organized won out. . . . .

Our activities all had one thing in common, and that was get the money and get the recruits. . . There were meetings, meetings, and more meetings both in the club room and on the street corners. . It was during this period that Local 65 United Wholesale and Wearhouse Workers Union Called a strike at Heeth's Dept. Store on 14th Street. The club undertook strong action to support the strike. Specific action was to march on the picket line, get money for to strikers, and on one saturday the club in a hody, (about 20 of us) desended on the store along with members of t AYD from other clubs. We all went into different dept's and there would proceed to distract the sales personnel, not intending to buy, but to keep them from waiting on other customers. We tried on clothing, put to s out of order, and on the overall had a very successful day keeping the volume of stores income down. . . The suggestion came from Lee Scharf who was a full time employee of the union. On March 15th 1947 I got a job at Grey Adv A ency on West 32nd Street NY City. I didn't know it when I started to work there, but the UOPWA was attempting to organize the shop. It was to be the first major 4 A agency to be organized. . As soon as I found out of the unions activities I joined, that was about three h after I started to work.

Lester Talkington, who did not work at Grey was Pres, of the local, which I think was Local 21. . . Talkington was later identified to me as a party member. . Norma Aaronson was overall head of the organizing attempt. I have seen her on a number of occasions at the arty Hq. as well as at Camp Unity, In 1949 she visited Puerto Rico, and was guest of the Communist Party There. Other Members of the Local were Joe and Nola Sacco, Herman Davis, there are others but at the time I can't remember there names. . There were between 5 and seven party members involved in the Grey Projetc. . . . . We were told to try to include Political issues whereever possible in the work at grey. . our leaflets were political. . A few parties were held where we would attempt to influence the none guild members. The Higher Paid em-

ployees would alhارتedly seem to take up the fight of the lower paid people. We would get name entertainment to the parties. . . I worked many nites to turn out leaflets for the camp. I would then get to the shop at 6 30AM and before anybody else got there would have the Union literature in every desk in the shop. . . . On Army Day 1947 a meeting was held at the Home of Joe Sacco to discuss the elections plans. . It was felt that because of the large turn over in the Agency we had better hold the election NOW. For if we waited we might lose. . . .

The election was held, and the union was defeated 108 to 37. . . . After the setback most of the party people at Grey left there jobs. . . . I was able to establish party policy and how it was used in UOPWA sometime later when I had joined the Party. During a period of unemployment I was sent down to the Union to see Sandy Beech. She was head of the unions placement center, and under party instruction would place party people in key jobs in UOPWA shops. . . . One job I got was in a Multi-House on East 30th or 31st Street. I only held the Job for about a week. I left due to ill health, but my duty there was to build the union in preparation for a strike. . also to make sure that one of the raiding CIO unions didn't steal the shop away. Other known Party members in UOPWA were Winnfred Norman, who at one time was Head of AYD, Aaron Kramer well known Communist Poet, Jack Greenspan and his Wife. . . . Irving Sherman of the Tompkins Sq Youth Club worked in UOPWA to try to build a Youth Branch of the Party there. . . . When I left NY Lefty Lefcuvitz was working in UOPWA trying to build a LYL Section there. . . . I kept up my membership in the Union until the day I was expelled from the Party. . . .

During the period of activity in Grey I kept up my activity in the AYD. The party people in the club were happy to see me take such an active part in union work. I was being pushed into Club leadership, in what seemed to me a job of grooming for something. I did not have to wait long to find out what I was being groomed for, and who was behind it. For late in May Julie and Dave began to feel me out about joining the party. I had never told them yes or no, and they seemed to know that I was trading a thin line on the subject. As far as they were concerned I was ripe and ready. I bought the Worker and the Daily Worker without any balking. My interest in party activities was high and I was a good worker. I began getting interested in Folk Music, it meant something new to me. I for the first time had the feeling that I belonged to something. Going to the parties, singing the new songs, it was a new life and I loved it. . . . As I look at it now, there were two opposing forces, of which the party was bound to win. . . . The first group was that of my childhood friends, fellows and girls who lived a very quiet life, stagnating on a street corner. . . . I thought I had seen too much, and done too much to be happy with the life I found in that confining circle. . . .

I guess that's why I turned to the Left Wing. They were the only people who seemed to move. I have since found out how wrong I was, but it wasn't that easy back in 1946, and 47. . . . I was ripe for the party, Julie and others in the club started to paint pictures of Camp Unity in wingdale New York. A party sponsored camp about 74 miles from New York City. I had made reservation for the week preceding Labor Day for it was to be AYD week at the Camp. Members of Club Roosevelt were at the Camp during my week there were, Julie Sheik, Carrol Pheffer, Barbara Jackson and some others whose names I don't remember at this time. Some of the Party members I met while at the camp were, Bob Stek, Elmer Bernstein, Norma Aaronson of the UPOWA, Lefty Lefcuvits of the Party Youth Section in NY County, Yale and Herb Queskin of Conn, Milt Sax from Union New Jersey. The efforts on the Part of Julie and Lefty were to recruit me into the party were hot and heavy that week. . When they saw me faltering, Lefty asked me to visit him at the Party hq 35 East 12th Street and talk out me problems. . . . Camp Unity was an entirely new experience for me. . I had been used to the normal kind of summer resort, where there was no bookshop, no politicians lecturing, and no fund raising for the communist party and its front groups. . . .

Camp Unity is build on a hill overlooking a lake, it has a guest capacity of about 500. They live in small huts, called bunks that accomodate 2 to 4 people. There is a mess Hall, and Social Hall, and a canteen, and a bookshop. A days activity starts about 8:30 when the first call for brekfest is made. . . . The morning newspapers (NY Times and Daily Worker) are always on hand. . about 9AM every morning there is a lecture in front of the bookshop, at about 10 your left on your own to do as you please. . 12:30 lunch and at 1:30

another lecture or some kind of "Political Game" in front of the bookshop. The same thing after the evening meal. . . . At about 9PM the social Hall takes over, where they have the weekly show, usually something written by a staff member or other member of the Cultural Div of the Party. . . . . In the evening everybody seems to let there hair down and the bunk parties begin. They consist of a guitar or banjos, some beer or whiskey. . . . when I was there most of the parties were raising money for the Dennis Defense. . . . (he was cited for Contempt of the House Committee On Un-American Activities) By the time the Party ended you usually had paired off with somebody and found a vacant bed. . . . . . As I have said before it was AYD week when I was there, and on the weekend a carnival was held to raise money for the AYD. . . . I vol. to help in the fund raising. . . .

On the Saturday Eve. I mounted a platform in the Social Hall, and with the help of all the Pipe Cleaners that could be gotten I started to make animals out of the pipe cleaners. . . . . I made a lot on noise and a lot of animals and when it was all over raised about 3 dollars for the AYD. The people who were trying to reenlist me tried all the harder, for my money making potential was to great to lose. . . . .

About a month after my return from Camp Unity I attended a Saturday nite social of the Joe York Club of the Mt. Eden Section of the Party. . . . It was here that I was recruited. Lee Scharf of the county office of the AYD vouched for me. . . . It was in Sept 1947 that I left my job at Grey Adv Agency. . . . . About a week before I joined the party I went downtown and joined Peoples Songs, who at the time were located on East 11th Street. Shortly after my joining the Party I was told that since I was a veteran I had to Join the American Veterans Committee. . . . FDR Chapter located in the Park Plaza Build. . . The Party didn't have control over this chapter, but they were a strong force in it. I told the Sect Org that I didn't have the money and didn't want to join. He said it was okay and that the Party would pay my dues and all monies due to be paid. . . . I then became a member of AVC but for voting only. . . . .

My activities in the Joe York (Youth Club of the Mt Eden Section) were in the AYD Club, and the local POA Chapter. . . Some of the Members of the Youth Club were Lee Scharf, Julie Sheik, Dave Yellen, Bernie Lippman, Carrol Pheffer, Rhoda, Evelyn ——; Evelyn, Beena Litch, Irene. There were others in the club, but at this time I can't remember there names. . . . . Our work in AYD was very closely tied up with that of Peoples Songs, I was part of an attempt to organize a Bronx Chapter, which met at the Club Roosevelt Hq on Tremont Ave. . . . We had very little success in the Peoples Songs Venture//. . . . . Some party members in the Peoples Songs Branch Were Terry Kramer, Joe Jaffee, Herb Plever. . . . . Other members of the Peoples Songs Br. Harry Kramer, Gwynnith Grobin, Zach, Janice Newirth. . . .

In March 1948 I moved from my home in the Bronx to a one room apt at 24 West 18th Street. It was a hard move to make for it was the first time that I moved away from home with the exception of my time in the army. My folks didn't like it and told me so, but I had my mind set and moved. . . . I get the apt. through a fellow named Randy Wood who I had met at Peoples Songs. (Randy was a member of the Ray Friedlander Youth Club CPUSA, YPA, AYD, ALP and Peoples Songs) As far as I know at the present time he is working for Columbia Records. He was renting an apt from a fellow named GREG. GREG was not a Party member, but saw nothing wrong with the idea of letting a few party members using his place. Greg was living with Johnny— -- a kid who had just gotten out of the service. Johnny was using the 18th Street address as a mailing address for the receipt of his mustering out pay. One month he complained about not receiving his check, and later that day Randy admitted borrowing it and cashing it at the Jefferson School Bookshop. What Randy did then, he was capable of doing again, but the important thing here is that he was not alone as a party member, and that the party never did anything to reprimand or help him. . . . He wasn't expelled for he was a Negro. The odd thing about the building on 18th street was that with the exception of the people living there all the tenants were members of the party. . . . .

The fellow on the top floor made contact with me when he found out that I was a party member in search of a club. I met him one nite about two weeks after I had moved into the building, there was a knock on the door and in he came. I told him that I didn't know where the party Hq was in that area and asked him to help me get established. He told me that anyone living in that block would be a member of Community Club #1 of the Chelsea section. I was told to go to section Hq on 25th Street & 8th Avenue and get the address of my next meeting,

and also to arrange to have my transfer completed. At the time getting a transfer was about as hard as a man in Korea requesting and getting a transfer because he was homesick. I eventually got my transfer. The following Thursday nite I arrived at the home of \_\_\_\_\_ who run the Art Gallary in the basement of Bookfair on West 44th Street. It was my first Party meeting away from the Bronx. Also in attendance were the couple who lived on the top floor of the house on 18th street, a sculptor who lived on west 20th or 21st street, and a few other people who I never got to know. The subject of that meeting and the three subsequent meeting of that club that I attended was the organization of Chelsea for Wallace. Our plan was to work one block at a time in getting a Block committee for Wallace . . . .

We were aiming at getting a group, as alrge as possible to work for Wallace in the Block, They would work under the Supervision of a Party Member in getting pledge cards signed and raising money for the campign. All of the activity was under the banner of the American Labor Party. Other activity in the club was to sell the Sunday worker in the streets and by door to door canvas. I worked at that for about 4 Sundays and averaged about 25 papers a Day. The Chelsea Party Hq. was on 25th Stret and 8th Ave. It was also the Hq for the Parties Waterfront Activity. During that Period whenever I had any business at the section hq, and arrived at nite, there was sure to be a meeting of Puerto Ricans For as it is now, Chelsea is one of the P. R. concentration areas in NY. I have established that up to this point I was a member of the Communist Party in the Chelsea Section. I was still a member of Club Roosevelt in the Bronx, but not active. My only activity in the Left Wing was downtown. I had left all activity in the Bronx. . . .

During the days I worked at Peoples Songs, getting adds for there second anniversary issue and also did odd jobs around there office on west 21street. I was a member of the U.O.P.W.A. but not active at the time. My other activity consisted of weedends at the Contemporary Writers Studio. I also had my first contact with the Jefferson School. I was a student and taking a course in Marxism (Marxism 1). I also at this time had some contact with the Jefferson School Chorus. I had become aquainted with the group through a George Margolin, who I had met at Contemporary Writers one Saturday Nite. I, being interested in folks music thought it would be a good idea to belong to some kind of a singing group, but as it turned out I had to much else to do to be able to devote enough time to the chorus. (The Chorus is now known as the American Peoples Chorus) Horace Grenel was then the conductor, but was in the process of leaving so that he could head Youngx Peaples Records. I have never known Grenel more than to just say hello to. As for his party xxxx membership, I don't know off that either, but from the the treatment of Young Peoples Records by the Party Bookshops and Peoples Songs I can say that YPR had party backing of the Party. . . .

Some of the first recording artists were booked out of the Peoples Songs Office and members of the Party (Betty Sanders, Ernie Leiberman, Pete Seeger, and the Weavers). YPR has since been sold and to the best of my knowledge has no connection to the party. I think they changed when they fired all the UOPWA employees and tried to break the union contract, there was a picket line and some name calling. Here we found a party controlled union being kicked out by a party set up organization. . . . Contemporary writers had a studio off East 19th Street between 4th Avenue and Broadway. . . . It was used to conduct classes for new writers in short stories, poetry, and all other aspects of writing. On Saturday and Sunday nites they had what were called "Writing Out Loud" affairs. They would get a Left Wing Author who belonged to their organization to speak and discuss some phase of writing . . . at times they would discuss new stuff writin by students and discuss it. . . . Party members who I know to be active in Contemporary Writers were Ann Rivington, Phil Bonofsky. . . . Rivington is now a reporter on the Harlem Worker and at the time was sect. of the organization. Bonofsky was a teacher in a class on short story writing . . . there were other party people active in there organization but I don't remember there names . . . Cont Writers took an active part in preparing material for the Wallace camp. . . . One Sat. Nite I met Eugene Koneckey, who was then head of the then going out of business, "Peoples Radion Foundation." He spoke of his new book on the Radion Industry. . . . We got to talking about the Radion Industry and he invited me to continue it another evening.

About a week later I met him at the home of his girl friend at number 3 or 8 Horatio, in Greenwich Village. We spent the whole evening together discussing the Radion and Television Industry. . . . He wanted to talk to me to see if I had

any material which he might use in a new book that he was preparing, and to get any material to back up his recently published book. He expressed himself fully on the party line in the industry and what he thought was needed in the continuation of the fight for FM radio. The reason for the Drive, in the fight for FM radio, as it was explained to me by Koneckey was; Under AM the number of Radio stations are limited, and most of them have already been built and are controlled . . . but that under FM there could be ten times as many stations, and that there were many ways to get a lisc. and build one. What would prevent a trade union or a church, or even private capital from obtaining a lisc in most of the population centers of the United States. The fact that the party had control of the Union, or that the Church had a pro Party Pastor, or the Private Capital came from the Party or its front gps has no bearing on the matter. The lip service on this question was based on the idea that FM had better reception than AM and that the American Public should have the best. Well you might have bought that idea, but what you didn't know is that the party was behind it, and would have used it to fill your home with Stalins Line. . . .

During that period I was working out of the office of Neal Wesley Production, 234 West 44th Street. I was doing free lance selling of Vaud Acts, and various odd jobs that enabled me to pick up spare change in and around the theatre area. Irwin Silber of Peoples Songs asked me (Feb 48) if I would be interested in soliciting adds for the Peoples Songs Anniv Issue, I told him that I would. . . . It was here that I met many of the People who I was going to work with at a later date in the Wallace Camp., as well as with Peoples Songs and Peoples Artists. Most of the Leaders in Peoples Songs were known to me as members of the Communist Party. (Lenny Jacobson, Harry Klein, Irwin Silber, Adolph Green, Betty Sanders, Pete Seeger, Ronnie Gilbert, Fran De Larco, Neil Pelodorie, Jackie Gibson, Freddie Hellerman, Ernie Leiberman, Lee Hays, Bob and Adrain Claborne, Wally Hillie, Bob Wolfe, Tonie Maggasu, Heleane Silber, Boots Cassatra, Jean and Ken Fox, Randy Wood) there were many other people connected with peoples songs who were connected with the party but at this time I can't remember there names. . . .

One of the contacts given to me was that of . . . Leo Schull, editor and publisher of "Actors Cues" on west 48th Street. I used this contact to get a greeting add for the Peoples Songs Bulitin, and found out that the office of actors cues was the center of the Broadway for Wallace movement. I was asked by schull to help them in the work by obtaining signed pledge cards in the Bdway area through my contacts there. Active in the Bdway For Wallace Movement was a girl named Dorothy who lived in the back room apt of the Actors Cues Office, she was later identified to me as a party member. About a week after my first contact with him Schull told me that it was not general knowledge, and not to spread it around, but Marcantonio needed money for the coming election, that he had gone very deep into debt, and would I with the help of a contact list that he gave me try to get some money for "Marc". I declined due to my other commitments. . . . I don't know if Schull was ever a party member, but that during the election in 48' he was very close. . . . I also during that period had contact with Stage For Action, which was identified to me by party members in the cultural movement as a Party Controlled Gp. . . . Other Party Front Theatre Groups that I had contact with were, Peoples Drama, Jefferson Theatre, Freedom Theatre, and the Wallace Caravans. . . .

It was in April 1948, that I met Mr. Brown, who worked at the Jefferson School. He was at the time Educational Director at the Greenwich Village Section of the Party. . . . He suggested that I get out of the adult club and transfer into the youth club in Chelsea, which I did. We usually met at that home of Helen & Saul Sofria, 301 West 24th Street NYC. . . . I didn't know if the club organizer was Helen or Saul, for they both assumed leadership of the club, and were our contact with the chelsea section and the new york county office. . . . Other members of the club were Marion Hillie, Herb and Judy Oppenheimer, or Oppenheim, and a guy named Irving, who at the time was being expelled from the American Legion or VFW. . . . There may have been one or two other members of the club but at this time I don't remember who they were. . . . Our main task in the club at that time was the preparation for May Day and the Building of a Youth For Wallace Group in the Chelsea Area. . . . We also had the task of sending a delegation to the section and county convention . . . there was no election at the time but Saul & Helen told us that it had been decided that they would go . . . that decided it . . . settled it. . . .

In the building of the Youth For Wallace we were never too successful in that area . . . we held parades in the community, sold literature and in general tried to drum up a club for Wallace, but up until the time I left that club in July 1949 we had not gotten anywhere except having the whole party club acting in a dule role of Party Youth and "Youth For Wallace". A few days before May Day that Party Put in a call for "Guards" to guard the parties national Hq on May Day Eve, May Day, and May Day Nite. Our club was assigned one, and I vol. I arrived at the party hq about 6 PM and went to the second floor where I found a surplus of guards, sleeping, playing cards, or just shooting the bull . . . all told there were about 150 men in 'the building that nite. . . . We had men on the roof, in all the hallways, in the basement, on the elevators. . . . All the guards had whistles and clubs and were prepared for any attack. The eveing was a quiet one until about 2:30 AM, when a whistle sounded on the 13th Street Entrance. . . . Men with clubs in Hand can a running from all corners of the building . . . as we got to the staircase we could see the tall figure of a man ascending the staircase. . . . The man who had the task of guarding the entrance had fled up the stairs to await his re-enforcements . . . we were all ready to pounce when the lights were turned on and it turned out to be the janitor returning from a coffee getting trip. . . . That was the first of four guard shifts that I pulled, and that was the only attack. . . .

Mel Brown had told me that he was to work at the Jefferson School summer Camp, Camp Sherwood, Hurleyville NY, where he and James Kepner were to run the Bookshop and Canteen. This was in April 1948, but sometime in May Kepner was was expelled from the Party for somethings in his past life. . . . He was charged with being Homosexual, and having had contact with an FBI agent while in Los Angeles. . . . Brown suggested that I try to get the job, for he felt that my experience in the canteen end of the job would be invaluable to the school. . . . After having an interview with Ruth Nesi, then the manager of the bookshop, and Dave Goldway the Exct. Sect of the School, and Ben Bordofsky of wholesale book corp. I got the job. First they investigated my party backround, and when it was found to be in order they got me released from party duties in N Y for the summer. About two weeks after Browns Suggestion I was informed that I had the job. I was to start working at the camp during the memorial day weekend, and then back to the city for a month of training in the bookshop, and then back to camp for the entire summer. Some of the people who worked at the camp who were known to me as party members either past or active then were AL NADLER, SHIRLEY NADLER, MILLIE WEITZ, RUTH POST, MEL BROWN AND BEN PASKOFF. . . .

The memorial Day Weekend was the worst the School had ever had at a summer resort. It started off on the wrong foot and continued that way all summer. It was cold that weekend and there weren't enough blankets. . . . The Saturday noon meal was okay with one exception. Someone in order to save a few bucks had forgotten to serve the main course. The thing that followed in the dining room was strange in party circles. 180 people all hitting their knives and spoons on the table screaming for food . . . it was like a hollywood prison picture. Other activity of the weekend was limited to lectures by Phil Foner, on the American Labor Movement, and the raising of funds for the school. . . . The Saturday Nnite Production were parts of Odets "Waiting for Lefty," & Marc Blitzstein's "Cradle Will Rock." The bookshop was active and a great deal of Lit. was sold. Some of which was: SUNDAY WORKER, FOR A LASTING PEACE AND A PEOPLES DEMOCRACY, NEW TIMES, SOVIET LITERATURE, LABOR MONTHLY, COMMUNIST REVIEW, POLITICAL AFFAIRS, MASSES AND MAINSTREAM, BOOKS BY STALIN, LENIN, MARX, ENGLES, AND MANY AMERICAN PARTY PEOPLE. After the weekend mel Brown stayed on at camp while I returned to the city for my training in the bookshop. . . .

A few days after our return from the Camp a staff meeting of the school was called to discuss the weekend and what would be done to correct it during the summer. Attending the meeting were Dave Goldway, Howard Selsam, Rosalie Berry, George Squires, Doxey Wilkerson, Harold Collins, Ben Paskoff, Ruth Nesi, Mel Brown, and myself.

It was decided that the people who we were renting the camp from needed some guidance from the school in the running of a left wing camp. Ben Paskoff of the schools staff was told that he would be the schools representative there, and would have to solve all problems. He didn't want to go but as he put it, "This is the beauty of Party democracy. Dave Goldway got up and said, "Harvey it has been decided that you will call square dances this summer" the only trouble was that I had never called one before, but because I had been

connected with Peoples Songs it was presumed that I should be able to call them . . . When the summer was over I was calling them . . . At the meeting the forthcoming lectures were discussed. It was planned to have a different lecturer every week speaking on one subject . . . we had to know in advance what the subject was so that we could plan the literature program. . . .

The lecturers that we had during the summer were: Dave Goldway, Phil Foner, Herbert Apthker, Abner Berry, Doxey Wilkerson, Howard Selsam, Sidney Finkelstein, Jim Nesi, Ben Paskoff. The subject matter was varied. Goldway spoke on the world situation, Foner on the labor movement USA, Apthker on the History of the Negro People, Berry on his trip to the south, Wilkerson . . . Selsam on Marxist Philosophy, Finkelstein on Jazz and "Peoples Culture" in relation to his book. . . Jim Nesi on China and the Far East. Nesi is with the Committee for a democratic Far Eastern Policy and is one of the present Party experts on the Far East . . . Ben Paskoff spoke on a number of occasions as a fill in with a number of topics to choose from. His specialty is History of the World, a Marxist view point. . . He also spoke on the forthcoming trial of the 12 party leaders, and the ouster of Tito by the cominform . . . During the summer I had my first contact with Liberty Book Club. Liberty was set up to compete with the Book Find Club. It seems as tho the party had supported and built Book Find, and as small talk around wholesale books corp had it, the head of bookfind was a party member, but at one point he refused to go along with a Howard Fast book, this the party didn't like, so the word was spread, canel your subs to bookfind and pick up one for Liberty. As far as the party was concerned Bookfind went from bad to worse, the last straw a dispute with the UOPWA. Well the Liberty Rep. was up to camp and saw Brown, who set the wheels in motion for getting subs that summer. We got the official okay to push it for all it was worth from the Party in New York. . . .

The first Liberty Book at the Camp was "The Big Yankee", the Bio of Brig Carlson of the USMC, the hero of the AYD. . . . The new york AYD once wrote Carlson and asked him if his name could be used in the naming of a club, his answer was printed on the back cover of the official AYD publication. From then until the day I left the party the Liberty Book Club was as much a Party Front as was the Young Communist League. . . There were a few occasions that I worked for the Book Club in a Sub Getting Capacity. I worked under Harry Klein, (Peoples Songs, Brighton Press Dir Comm Report) and Tillie Goldway wife of Dave Goldway of the Jefferson school. . . I was told by Klein that Howard Fast was a member of the Board of Liberty. . . Russell the director of Liberty, don't know if he was a party member of not. . It was in the summer of 1948 that I started to lose interest in the party, but I didn't know how to quit, . . contact the FBI or any other anti-party agency. The party had built up and still has in operation what to my mind as t e most high pressure hate organization in the United States. . . It is not easly seen, for the undertones can sometimes only be seen by a party member. . . .

They call anyone who is opposed to them "WITCH HUNTERS, FASCISTS, SMEAR MONGERS" and many other names. While they are doing that, and quite well I might add, they go about there merry way doing the things that they accuse the anti party forces of doing. . . . I had fallen for the party line on this subject, and that is probably the one reason that I didn't go to the FBI for over a year. . . . I was frightened I didn't know what would happen. For as the party painted there picture, all that I could see was a three eyed monster in the FBI and this Committee. . . Well getting back to the summer camp, and what happened there. . . One morning we were talking about TITO, and enjoyning the War in Greece, and all the unrest in the eastern countries. . TITO \*\*V A TITO, he was the man of the hour, he had taken the fascists and destroyed them, the love of the party was his. . . Twenty four hours later there were some mighty confused people. . What had happened? Tito, it can't be! I Don't believe it! .

All the props reversed themselves, and the party had to do a flip flop. The fastest thing in the world to me is a communist in the United States doing a Flip Flop, an about face on an affair such as the Tito deal. . . In New York all Hell broke lose on the question of the Yugoslav Home on West 41st Street. . The people there were split down the middle. . . The party had to muster all its forces to hold its most important National Home in NY. As of the Day I left NY the Party still had controll Of the Yugoslav Home. . On the Day the Justice Dept. Ind. the 12 Party leaders I was having a talk with Susan Woodruff (One of the three old ladies who used to own the daily Worker) the radios came across loud and clear with the news. . . party people were again in a

state of shock, the party people there didn't know what to make of it. . . . A part organize from the noth bronx was there and was immediately put to work leading a discussion of the ind. . . . he got people organized and as my letter to the daily worker shows we did have some action. . . . All action planned was headed by the Party Org from the bronx, Ben Paskoff, and myself. . . . The party handled the whole affair, as it did at the camp all summer. . . .

I returned to the city after labor day 1948, and was informed that there were no openings in the book shop set up. Ruth Nesi did tell me about a job that she had recommended me for at People Songs. I had broken all sales records for a bookshop in a summer camp the size of Camp Sherwood. For my efforts in behalf of the school during the summer I received a scholarship in the Marxist Institute for one year. The Institute is composed of a series of courses on marxism, Dialectal Materialism, Marxism and Labor, World History, Political Economy, (Party Style), Communist Party and the Negro People, History of the Negro People in the USA . . . Marxism and the Women Question . . . Some of the instructors were Bea Siskind (Political Economy) Dave Goldway, Howard Selsam (Philo I) George Squires (Marxist and Labor) Ben Paskoff (History of the World) Doxey Wilkerson (Marxist and the Negro Question) . . . . The courses extended from September 1948 to June 1949, this was the first year institute, there were to be a second and third year, in fact as long as you were a member of the party you could keep going up in number institutes . . . . We attended classes every thursday nite from 6:30 to 10:00 PM broken down into two courses a nite . . . . The cost was 40.00 a year and the party wanted all mebers to take it, for the school needed the money, the party also wanted a large enrolment of party members for they felt that of the members attending many leaders could be gotten for the work of building the party . . . Some of the Party People who attended the classes were Art Saha, Herbert & Judy Oppengeimer, Dois Callen, Sue Buckingham, Viki Gotlieb, and Angelea Calamouris.

When Miss. Calamouris startes to testify at the trial of the 11 Communist Leaders at Foley Sq. there was a great deal of activity at the school, and especially in the class. Someone had turned her chair over as a gesture of something which I haven't been able to figure out to this day. We were studing Marxist and the Labor Movement with George Squires instructing . . . . He went into a long speech on the role of the "spy" in the Communist Party, however his speech didn't have much effect except to build the fear that was already in the minds of most of the class members . . . . At that time I was working at the New York County Office of the Party, and I recall a muster of all the people who knew Miss Calamouris at the Trial Defense Office its intent was to slander Miss Calamouris in any way possible . . . I suspect that about right now the party is doing the same thing on the question of ME . . . . Getting back to my job at Peoples Songs. I was employed to head the Peoples Music Center. I was to raise money for the Organisation by the sale of Phono Records, Music Books, Sheet Music, and musical Instr . . . .

I also had to handle the distribution of material for the Wallace Camp that was produced by Peoples Songs. The 1948 election camp, was during the period of the "Record Ban" of the musicians Union, but that didn't stop Peoples Songs. Records ban or no, they produced a number of records without music dealing with the election, (Merry Go Round Song with Mike Loring\* Battle Hymn of 48' Paul Robeson\* Wallace Fit The Battle Of Jerico) . . . . Here we found the "Friends of The Union" "Liberators of the Working People" producing records in direct opposition of what the union was doing. . . . It was not the first or last time that the Party or Its front worked against a Union when it stood in the way of what the party wanted. . . . My job at Peoples Songs lasted from September 1948 to February or Marc 1949. . . . It was full time day work and sometimes required my presents at nite. . . . besides handeling all records and sheet music distribution I also worked at Hootenanny's and Wingdings. A hootenanny is a sing session (wingding a small Hoot) We held them about once a month in either the Yougoslav Home on west 41st street, The Irving Place, The Local 65 Hall, Webster Hall. . . .

Every Hoot had its political over and undertones. We had one for Wallace, one on the Hollywood Ten, One to protest the Ind. of the Party Leaders, as well as many other subjects that were high on the parties list of issues. . . . At the Hoots we set up music center and sold our wares in the form of records, music sheets, and song books. Peoples Songs had contact with some foreign national Groups such as the British Workers Music association. We sent them copies of the Peoples Songs Book, and our monthly publication, and in return they sent

us there publications, and records, one of which was the "International". . . If you trace the History of Peoples Songs from its inception in 1946 through 1948, and then continuing with Peoples Artists you will find that it reflects the Party like a fine polished mirror. . . The Hoot. played an important role in the elections of 1948, 1949, 1950, and will do so this year. The use of folk music, and folk singers in the street meetings, and other political rallies. In 1948 there was a Wallace Caravan group who toured the country singing in the mines and mills and towns all over the country. The use of singers in the Picket lines. One of the important factors of the CCNY strikes of a few years ago was the use of folk singers on the lines. They were able to keep the spirit of the strike high and probably prolonged it a day or so. Peoples songs played a very important role in the organization of the Youth movement in the left wing, for it was through them that a great many young people got there interest in the AYD, LYL, and YPA. Through Folk Dancing at the American Folksay Group, and Hootanny's young high SCHOOL KIDS RECEIVED THERE FIRST TASTE OF THE LEFT. . . .

From there it was a simple job in many cases to get them into the youth organizations, and in some cases into the party. During the summer groups of singers use Washington Sq Park as there stage and attract many people. A typical Sunday afternoon will find a group of singers out in the sun singing and getting you interested in the work . . . what comes next is a trip to a hootenany and then you might be in line for the YPA etc. . . . Groups like the "Weavers" who have made a name for themselves nationally are part of this plan of attracting the youth. . . . Peoples songs received a large sum of money from the Progressive Party in 1948 to enable them to carry on there propaganda work. the money ran out in march of 49 an that's when Peoples Songs Folded. There were time when the Part contacted Peoples songs and had them prepare programs for such meeting as the Lenin Mass Meetings. . . .

The reason for the disolvement of Peoples Songs was to get out of payment of the bills, they had no intention of stopping there work. They just re-organised under the name Peoples Artists, moved there office and changed directors. . . . During the Wallace Camp, I worked with Boots Cassetta, who was employed by the Progressive Party at 39 Park Avenue. Boots moved to New York from L. A. where he was head of the Peoples Songs Org., he also founded Charter Records an outfit which specialized in "Peoples Songs" recordings. . . . Boots lived at my apt. 167 East 2nd Street. On the nite he moved into the apt. he told me he was a member of the Communist Party. . . . Upon my return from Sherwood I moved to an apt. 167 East 2nd Street. It was there that I met Art Saha. I transferred into the Ray Friedlander Youth Club of the Tompkins Sq Section of the Party. Some of the Members of that club were: ART SAHA, HARRY GAY, LEFTY AND LAURA LEFCUWITZ, SUE BUCKINGHAM, MESHIE AND IRENE RHEINFELD, YORK LEE (HAD been a member of the Chinese C. P.), JACK WALKENSTEIN, GLORIA HOROWITZ, GLORIA SEAGER, VIKI GOTLIEB, SEYMOUR FINKEL, DICK IRELAND, JIGGS . . . ROZ, BROWNIE AND FRITZ BROWN, BOB SCHLANGER, MANNY, SAM STEINBERG, JAMES KEPNER, RODGER DANIELS, RANDY WOOD, JIELEANE SILBER, SID, MURRY TURETSKY TZVIA TURETSKY, LIZ HALPERN, TISH. . . . I was a member of the Ray Friedlander club until my expulsion from the Party in January 1951. . . .

I held the positions of Press, Literature, and Educational Director of the Ray friedlander Club, as well as the job of Org. Sect. . . . Our main activity was to build the YPA in the community and recruit YPA members into the Party, which was accomplished without to much trouble. . . . We also had the task of working in the CRC on the lower east side, and helping the other youth clubs in there Puerto Rican work. . . . Ruby, who was a party member in the youth section on the lower east side was head of the East Side Federation Of Social Clubs. It is a Party controled gouncil which is attempting to gain control of the unified social clubs in that area. . . . Through the Federation they hope to get money, signatures, and people to do any leg work that is necessary, as well as recruits for the party. . . . An example of party control of the federation was a meeting which I attended with Art, who was then section Org, Moshie, and Ruby. . . . we were looking for woman party member to be on the exct. of the council. . . when the meeting was over it was decided that Roz would be that person . . . no election, by the federation or the party, but choice dictated from above. . . .

That same policy of dictation was true in the choice of members for the party ext. and any job in the party club. . . . it also held for the YPA for in all the time that I was a member of the Ray Friedlander Club, and a members of the YPA all policy that the YPA carried out was set up in the meeting of the party . . . we decided who would be in what office, and what the club activity would be . . . it even went down to what nites the YPA could have a social affair. . . . If they wanted one on the 15th and that was the nite of the Daily Worker Dance we saw to it that the YPA had its party on the 22nd. . . . During the Sub drive if we in the party had to canvass the community for subs, and the YPA had to go to the Marcantonio Area, we didn't go to the Marc. Area, but sold subs, and found some other activity for them to do. . . . Every aspect of the YPA was controlled by the party as if it had been a party club . . . and when the recruiting drive was over the YPA was a party club in that 99% of its membership were party members. . . . Another example of Party Control of the YPA was in January 1949, when I was called to the Party Office at 35 Eats 12st Street by Ernie Parent who was then County Youth Organizer for the Party. . . . He introduced me to Irene Wheeler who was then on the NY State Committee of YPA. . . . She had attended the World Youth Fest Meet in Prague in 1947. . . . Parent introduced here as a member of the Party. . . . I was told that I was chosen to help the State Office build a Nite Club in order to raise money. . . . The party made the choice and YPA abided by it. . . .

It was about the same time that at a meeting of the Tompkins Sq YPA Club tow members turned out to be members of the socialist workers party. . . . The ejection of those two men was the only time the party came out into the open in the YPA club . . . there were some non party people at the meeting, and felt very stronge about democracy, not knowing that there YPA club was controlled by the party. . . . But at that meeting they saw the light. . . . As well as losing the Two S. W. Party men they lost about 4 other members. . . . Around the turn of the year 1948-49 there was a drive on in the Party to get a large Mobelization to Washington on the Mundt Nixon Bill. . . . for about three weeks thaths all we did on the lower east side . . . get money, and ready people for Washington. We were able to get some support from the social clubs, on the basis of the work of the east side federation . . . when the mobelization finnaly came off we sent about 25 people there. . . . We had one car, and rented three others. . . .

In december of 1949 the Worker started its annual subscription drive. I had not givin it to much thought, and an the end of three weeks found myself leading up the driv having sold 65 subs. . . . Everbody in the Yoouth Movemnet was happy about the whole thing, for it had been a LOn time since the Youth Walked away with the county prize. . . . I didn't know it when the drive started but there was a trip to Puerto Rico in store for the winner. . . . It was in a sunday in december a a county wide press party as called for all those who had sold over five subs. . . . It was held in the Hank Forbes Aud. in New York County. . . . Ben Simonofsky County Press Director headed the Meeting. . . . He introduced me to Connie Bart of Phil. She suggested that Ben and I go down to Phile on the Following tuesday and address a meeting of the Phila Party on the Sub question. . . . We got county approval and arrived in Phila. . . . Henry Winston was the Main speaker of that Meeting others in attendance were Mother Bloor, Walter Lowenfelds. . . . The main body of the Phila Party was there but I never was active there and I didn't know them. . . .

At that meeting Winston discussed the need for more party people to leave the white color jobs in the east, and for the party to get off its intelectual horse and go out into the basic industry as was done in the 30's during the organisation of the CIO . . . I pledged a goal of 300 subs to the paper at that meeting . . . nobody believed that I could do it, and as it turned out they still don't . . . for I was expelled for selling over three hundred subs . . . We left Phila at about mid-nite, Winston, Simonofsky and myself . . . The discussion on the train delt with the parties role in the progressive party and a continuation of the subject that Winston had opened at the meeting in Phila . . . Winston did most of the talking and Simonofsky and myself did most of the listening . . . The sub drive went along for 12 weeks and at no time was I out of the . . . of first place . . . I sold subs at the Jefferson School, in the Peoples Songs Office, at the Progressive Party Hdq. at the office of Liberty Book Club in the Jefferson Bookshop, at the Daily Worker Dance I sold about 20 Subs . . . when the drive ended I had fulfilled my pledge of over 300 subscriptions to the Paper . . . and at the Latin Memorial Meeting at St. Nicholas Arena I was awarded the trip to Puerto Rico . . .

During the Sub Drive I tried to sell one to my mother, who by nature didn't like my policies said No . . . but not to be turned back I kept on and one day she said okay I'll buy your ag but it won't come in my name, with that she proceeded to fill in the sub blank with the name of my dog GINGER MATUSOW, that was okay, but a few months ago the door bell rang and a charming voice asked for Ginger Matusow, and would she like to renew her sub to the worker . . . After the downfall of Peoples Songs I found myself out of work, I had a period of a few months in which to do nothing, for I had been assured the job at Camp Unity for the summer. I went down to UOPWA and saw sandy Beech who was head of the Employment Center of Local 16 . . . I had met her the previous summer at the Jefferson School Camp . . . I told her that I needed work and that as a party member I would like to go into a work shop and try to build . . . I had received encouragement from Jack Greenspan, Winnie Norman, and Aaron Kramer who worked in the Local . . . Greenspan, an organizer was very anxious to get me into one of his shops . . . in the direct mail line . . . I finally got a job, but due to a bad back which I received in the last war I had to quit . . . A few other attempts were made to try to get me into UOPWA shops but because of my Party work it never materialised.

In March 1949 Dora who worked at the switchboard at the PY county Hq of the Party left to attend leadership school. (School was Conducted at the Jefferson School.) I got her job. I worked with Carrie Possy of the Party Youth Movement. . . . My job was to handle the switchboard and handle anything else that might come up. . . . I had to take and disseminate messages to various Party County and States Leaders. . . . During my few months there I saw everybody who came and left the county office at 35 east 12th street, as well as all those who attended meetings at the Hank Forbes Auditor. . . . The trial was going on at Foley Sq and the Hq was very busy. . . . During the Cab Drivers Strike in NY the Party tried to Take over, and almost did. . . . They had men in flying squads all over the city, memo's working five-time. . . . The party Labor Leaders (Nornie Ross, Quiney Goldberg) there were others but they were members of the Cab driving industry and I had never seen them before the strike. . . . Many of them did speak of taking part in the previous strikes, and would like to see some more action in this one. . . . One day John Lautner came down from the Fifth Floor and told me to call all the organisers that I could get hold of and have them send men down to the defense office and when I finished to get down there. . . . I Called and then left for the Office of the Defense Council for the Party Leaders. . . .

When I got there I found a group a men, most of whom I had seen before but whose names I didn't know. Walter Garland was leading the meeting. . . . He told us that Paul Robeson was due to testify on the following day and that we were to assigned guard positions in and around Foley Sq. Five of the biggest men were assigned to ride with him in the car, and as I said the rest of us were placed in and around the court house. . . . All during this meeting not a word was spoken, but rather all was writin. That and on other occasions in that office and the party office people had the feeling that the walls had ears. . . . Bill Norman, One of the men being sought by the FBI, lent me his car to pick up a disposition of some kind connected with the trial. . . . Occasionally I would visit the defense office and vol. my services. . . All during the trial the party had the feeling that it was going to lose but nobody seemed to mind that very much. . . . May day was coming and the whole party was preparing for it. . . I was even more anxious than the rest for the week after May Day I was Due to Leave for Puerto Rico. . . . I had met Juan Santo of the Puerto Rican Party when he was in New York. . . . He was introduced to me by Alexander Trachtenberg at a Christmas Party at the Jefferson School in 1948. . . .

I had met Trachtenberg at the Party Hq. when I first got my job at the Jefferson School. . . . He is the man who had the party line. . . . He heads the party publishing house, International Publishers, the Party School, Jefferson School, has been a member of the National Committee, was when I left Head of the Cadre and Review Commision. . . . He also has done many other things which I am not familiar with. . . . During the Sub drive I approached him to buy a sub to the Worker, and he told me on more than one occasion, "I have never had a sub, They put one in my box so why should I spend my money" that to me is the perfect example of party leadership, wanting all the little guys to do the work, spend the money, but what do they do. . . . In preparation to my trip to P. R. I was told to read up on the subject, and that as far as the party was concerned the place to go was the Frederick Vanderbilt Field Library on west 26th Street,

the party was right. . . . They had a student strike in P. R. shortly before my visit there, and it was decided that greeting should be taken from the leaders of the CCNY strike to the PR striling leaders. . . . In the Strike at CCNY the party through its Student Division, offices at the time on the 3rd floor of 35 east 12 street were mainly the instegators of the strike. . . . They were the ones who were arrested, Fits Squires, and Bob Fogel, Rae, Otis McCray, James Coleman, Anne—and many other party people were directly in the lead of the Strike. . . .

They held meetings at the Party Hq which was no more than 5 feet from the switchboard where I worked. . . . They used party mino machine and paper to turn out a STRIKERS NEWSPAPER. . . . When the delegation went to city hall they had the signs made. . . . Its true there were many non party members in the strike, but on every phase of it the party was in the lead. Now getting back to Puerto Rico. . . .

I went with Ted Bassett who at the time was NY County Educational Director and member of the State Puerto Rican Commision. . . . Ben Davis was supposed to go on the trip but due to the trial at Foley Sq he didn't. . . . Before we left George Blake NY County Chairman of the Party briefed us on what to expect and who to see. . . . I also met with Juan Emanullie who told me something about the history of the Party in PR and what they were doing. . . . One of the reason that Bassett was chosen was that a year or so before our trip he spen some time in Cuba doing work for the American Party. . . . We left New York via Pan American Air Lines and arrived in PR about 6 AM. . . . and had to wait for a later hour to contact the party. . . . Our first contact was with Juan Sias Corales, Head of the UOT, Party Controlled Trade Union . . . he told us where party Hq was and sent us up there. . . .

We were not received warmly at first for all the people that we met did not know us or of our trip. . . . It wasn't until about 1 PM when Juan Santo arrived at party Hq that we received an official welcome. The first day was spent getting a hotel Room (Hotel Euelid). We met Ceasar Andreau, and Consulo Sias Corales. . . . Ehgene Cubes. . . . One of the reasons for our trip was to help in the setting up of a party press, we had the information needed as to how the money was to be gotten (to come from the USA Party) the first paper was edited by Jaun Sias, and under the guise of trade union press, but at a later date it changed its name to Pueblo and became a Party Paper. . . . The presses were run by a man who was introduced to us by Santo, he told us that he had been in Bogata Columbia during the revolt, at the meeting of the foreign Ministers. . . . We were told of the trip to PR by Wm. Foster and George Blake. . . . During the visit there of Blake and Foster, Santo was taking Blake around the Island. At one point on top of one of the mountains in the center of the Island, with Santo Driving new car, he turned to Blake and said, "How do you like the trip, you know this is my first day of driving". . . .

Foster stayed at what was then the largest hotel in PR, at no expense to the party. . . . As the story was related to us by Santo, the Hotel is owned by Juan Trijillo of the Dominican Reb, and that Trijillo has spent a great deal of money backing the Nationalist Party in PR. . . . The Nationalists through the Hotel Owner payed that part of Fosters expenses. . . . Santo as well as other party members explained to us that the other national movements in Latin America supported them, both the Party and the Nationalist Party. The party line as I saw it in the USA was that we don't support any nationalist party, for they are Fasiest, but when I got to Puerto Rico I saw something that the text book hadn't talked about. . . . The nationalist Party a bedfellow of the CP. . . . They worked together on almost every issue . . . wherever we went we were introduced to members of the Nationalist Party, they were taken into the confidence of the CP. . . . When I got back I learned that it was also the case in N. Y. where at the Party Sections where there was PR work going on, they were working with the nationalists. . . . At the Hank Forbes Section on second Avenue a Nationalist Party Family lived there. . . . At the Lower Har---- Section Hq, they along with Party Lit distribute Nationalist Party Lit. . . . In the town of Caba Rojo I was introduced to one of the Nationalist Youth Leaders (He had been expelled from the University during the strike). He knew I was a communist Party Member, was friendly invited me to his home and gave me pictures of Albiso Compos, as well as a Flag of Lares. . . .

I have since Givin the Flag to the P. R. Club (Clube Lares Of The Party) on the Lower East Side. . . . There is nothing in writing that shows the tie with the Nationalist and Communist Party, but as I saw and lived my weeks there, there is no two ways about it being one party of force and violence activily working to get rid of the United States. . . . They have songs and

slogans. BASTA YA, BASTA YA BASTA YA QUEL YANQUI MANDE—which means that's enough of the Yankee Mandate. . . . Its a popular song down there. . . . They also talk of INDEPENDANCIA AMORA—Independence Now. . . . The party in PR. has control of the UGT or CGT under the leadership of Juan Sias Corales. . . . He is also Trade Union director of the Party. . . . They control the Construction Workers Union under the direction of Andreau. . . . They have made strong inroads among the Sugar and textile workers, as well as the salt workers at Caba Rojo . . . in Fact, there is not an industry that the Party Controlled Union does not have a good hold on. . . .

Before I left New York I was told to contact the Party Youth Leader, as well as the Party Leaders, Andreau and Sante and make arrangements for the sending of a delegate to the World Youth Fest, being held in Budapest Hungary. The New York Party was prepared to pay for the trip, and handle all the details about getting the Visa and all other paper work. . . . "American Youth For A Free World" did the actual work on this matter for the Party. After a meeting with Andreau it was decided that Cubes would be the delegate. . . . Everywhere we went in island we were introduced as American Communists, and it didn't seem to make any difference. . . . If you ask a Puerto Rican Nationalist, or Independent Party Member, "Are You A Communist?" the usual answer is "Yes, I Am, but first I work for Puerto Rican Freedom, and then I'll help the Communist work for communism . . ." When we were there, the party was small in number, but as far as there influence goes, it is large, and has freedom of movement. . . . For many years the Party had put up a cry to rid the city of San Juan of El Fanguito, (The Mud Hole). They used the sight of el Fanguito to fight us, and they built a strong organization there. . . . Well Gov Marino was elected and said he would clean up the Fanguito, and was ready to start when I was there. . . .

Hold on said the party, you can't chase these people from there homes . . . Just to make an issue of it. . . . First it was tear it down, and then when someone listened and was ready to tear, they said you can't evict these peoples. . . . Bassett, Consullo, called a meeting of the Party Members in el Fanguito on the question of the evictions . . . . about 300 peoples attended, most of whom were not party members. . . . Juan Santo told us to pack for we were going on a trip around the island, we left San Juan and arrived in Ponce that nite. . . . We were introduced to some of the party members there, one Doctor, and Lawyer as well as many union members in the Fertilizer plant there. . . . All during this trip we were able to do into any Sugar Mill and walk around at will, all the people we met there knew tht we were party members but said nothing. This fact did not limit itself to the sugar mills, but was so in the salt processing plant at caba Rojo, and in the new Textile Mills. . . . New York sent word through Bassett that the Party in P. R. had been falling down on the job, there organisation was not growing. . . . To correct this situation they sent Juan Emmanuel down, and in six weeks he helped organise 17 new party clubs on the Island. . . . The only two active Puerto Rican Communists were Jane Speed and her Mother. Jane speed is Mrs. Caesar Andrean. . . .

The nite I returned was the nite of the by election in NY that elected FDR Jr. . . . The ALP Caudxx was Dr. Annette Rubinstein, also a teacher at the Jefferson School. . . . I made arrangements to meet Bassett and Clara March at the Jefferson Section, on west 72nd Street. . . . It was about 8:30 PM and all were present, including a fellow named Hidalago who told us that his father was from P.R. . . . we spent the evening getting election returns and talking about Puerto Rico. . . . The next day Hidalago was the Gov't witness at the Trial of the Party Leaders. . . . He did Mention my name in his testxxxxx. . . They were having a fund drive in the party during this period, I was assigned to the job of Fund Drive Director of the Tompkins Sq Club. . . . One name that I haven't mentioned up to this point comes in now. . . . He was the Exct Sect of the Armenian Youth Of America. . . . GEORGE. . . . I had to see him on a numbe of occasions to try to get his quota for the drive. . . . I had to visit him at his office, on 12th street, across the street from Party Hq. . . In the course of conversation he explained the set up of his organization and to what extent it was party controled. . . . There was a map of the USA on the wall with red dots showin the location of the local c apters. . . . According to George most of the clubs were under the control of the Party. . . . They included clubs in Ohio, Pa, Mass, NY. . . .

Bassett And I gave report to many meeting of the Party at the County and State Hq. . . . We had three meetings with the Puerto Rico Commission. . . .

In attendance were Israel Ampter, Bassett, and at these meeting it was decided that I would work in Lower Harlem with the Party Youth Club There. . . . Monnie Callen, and Helen Rodrigues, Bill Villa. . . . The work in that area only lasted until July 1949 when I went to Camp Unity. . . . Our first job was to get a delegate to the Founding conference of a Labor Youth League. . . . It was held in Chicago during the Memorial Day Weekend. . . . The party insisted on having a Puerto Rican there, however we were unsuccessful in getting a delegate. . . . We also tried to get someone to go to Budapest. . . . We didn't want a party member but someone who was a member of a front Gp. . . . A few Youth were contacted but when they found out it was party controled they backed out. . . . The first talk about a Labor Youth League was had during the Wallace Camp. It was decided at the National Conv. that a new Party Youth Org would be formed. . . . They were waiting for the end of the Pres. Camp to start it. . . .

The Fri. Nite before Christmas a county leadership meeting was called at teh Hank Forbes Aud, 35 East 12th Street. . . . Speakers at the meeting were Aronld Johnson, Lou Diskin, Ernie Parent. . . . We were setting up the foundation for the LYL, by setting up county Youth Sections. . . . There were about 150 party youth present at the meeting. . . . Johnson spoke of the need to go out into the industrial centers of the country and get a hold in basic indusrty. . . . Diskin spoke of the need of a marxist leninist youth org. and how since the end of the YCL thee was a nedd for that kind of org. . . . New York County Was split into Three Sections. . . . East Side, with a sub section in the 18th CD. . . . West Side, and Harlem. . . . Art Saha Was chosen section Org of the East Side section, with Joe Tarentola sub Section Org, under Saha. . . . Harry Gay was picked for the job of West Side Org. . . . and Teak Thomas org. for Harlem. . . . Ernie Parent was County Org. . . . and Lefty Lefenwitz as Org Sect and Industrial Org. . . . Also discussed at the meeting was the Sub drive of the Worker, and how could we reach more Youth with the paper, as part of our organizaing drive. . . . After the founding convention of the LYL we recruited all the members of the Lower Harlem Youth Club CP into the LYL, and for all the time that I was there those were the Only LYL members. . . . The Plan was to disband all the party youth clubs, transfer all the members to a community club for dues and other administration, and for political leadership the LYL. . . .

It didn't go as planned for they transfer was still going on in sept. . . . Shortly after my return from PR the party protested something that Mr Ryan had done in the longshoremans union. . . . They charged him with discrimination in an all Negro Local. . . . Next thing that happened was an all nite picket line at the Union Hq. on 14th Street, not conducted by members of the Local in question but by party members from all over the city. . . . The line was broken very suddenly when a group of longshoreman deceipted that the party had no business there ,they just came at the line and the party vanished. . . . I got my picture on the front page of the New York Sun, Post and in the Journal American due to that Picket Line. . . .

The Jefferson School did not go back to Camp Sherwood, but moved to their old camp Arrowhead, in Ellinville NY. . . . I worked there over the Memorial Day weekend. . . . The school lecturer was Sidney Finkelstein. . . . However it was decided that for the summer I would work at Camp Unity. . . . I arrived at Camp Unity in the Last Week of June. . . . Known Party Members working there: Bob Stek, Jo Steck, Elmer and Pearl Bernstein, Bob and Betty De Comier, Otis and Phillis McCray, Jim Coleman, Paul Robeson Jr. Marylin Robeson, Viki Gotlieb, Lenny Kogel, Max Furman Phillips, Herb Sufrin. . . . Some of the Speakers we had during the summer were: Paul Robeson, Morris Schappes, Aaron Kramer, Exet Sect of the Vets Of The Lincoln Brigade, Phil Frankfeld and his wife.

Doxey Wilkerson, Abner Berry, Viki Lawrence, Bob Fogel, Louis Harap, John Gates, and Lilian Gates. . . . In August 1949 we were informed of the happenings at Peekskill New York . . . and also told to have a large group (mostly men) at the planned concert for the following week. . . . Bob Stek, Myself, Quincy Goldberg and a few other Communist Party Members helped in the organization of the Peekskill Affair from the Camp Unity End. . . . We had 36 Cars, all driving bumper to bumper from Wingdale NY to Peekskill . . . in all the Cars there were Baseball bats, clubs, and other blunt items. . . . As we told the people going, "Its a picnic and you might want to play Ball, so take a Bat along." We all went to Peekskill looking for trouble, we took few women along, and no children. . . . During the summer there was fear of being attacked by someone, who I'll never know. . . . We had set up a Guard, which you pulled

once a week, for four hours. . . . It was not to be general knowledge, and only the Party men at the Camp were to know about it. . . . A meeting was called at the main building, in attendance were Bob Steck, Myself, Paul Robeson Jr, Bob De Comier, Elmer Bernstein, Jim Coleman, Lenny Kogel, and a few others whose names I don't remember. . . . Other staff activity were the Marxist Classes held weekly at the camp. Two subjects, Marxist and the Women Question, and Marxism and the Negro question. . . . All members of the Staff who were Party members were required to attend. . . .

My job at the Camp was Managing the Book Shop.. and all that went with it.. I had meeting with Ben Bordofsky of Wholesale Book Corp on what literature to push, special attention of party stuff, and getting it into the hands of non party people.... The Literature sold here was basically the same as that sold at the Jefferson School the Summer Before, with one major change, Fosters Book "Twilight of World Capitalism".... We had all sorts of games that were party poop.... We played one called "Bottechille" a left wing 20 Questions, another called Picasso Charades, other activity on the lawn in front of the bookshop was a twice Weekly Poetry Reading Session, the reason was to sell books of left wing poets. DON WEST, MIKE QUINN, AARON KRAMER and others.....

During the week we also had staff conducted lectures on the Women Question and on the Negro Question... I spoke at a number of these meetings..... Near the end of the Summer I was informed that Joe Bucholt, then acting State Director of the LYL wanted to see me... He informed me that I was to be the State Literature Director Of the Labor Youth League..... Bucholt was taking Lou Diskins Place, who was at the time attending the World Youth Fest in Budapest,,, When Diskin Returned he told me that he had met with Jay Peters in Hungry....

About the same time Bordofsky informed me that I would be working at the Workers Book Shop from Sept until December..... When I returned to the city I met Cubes who had just returned from attending the Youth Meeting in Hungry.... I, with Mannie Callen, accompanied him on a trip around NY city where he spoke of the Youth Meeting and its relation to Puerto Rican Indep. He told of the "world fight against American Imper. and that it was appreciated that P. R. suffered more than any other country"....etc....

The party had just published a new Book by Anna Louise Strong on China, and a booklet on Korea, all out play was to be givin to these books, they were selling well, and had beenout for about three weeks, when BAM.... SOVIET UNION EXPELLED STRONG FOR BEING A SPY etc... The next day we didn't have a copy of the book, sorry sold out.... the flip flop once again....

A Camp Unity they had some grand plans for a fall and winter activity in the City.. The social staff al planned to continue with there work and enlarging on it in a community center.. The wheels were turning, and out came FREEDOM THEATER, Bob stock of the Camp was the first head and driver on the project.... The First Chairman was Furman Phillips.....

All the People who worked at the camp that summer were active in the plan, plus Ernie Leiberman, Joe Jaffee. . . .There first meeting place was at 106 East 14th Street, The present location of Peoples Artists. . . before the first of the year they moved to the Czech. Workers Home on East 72nd Street. Here was the place that the plan for community action was to take hold. . . . The building had three floors, an audit., a bar in the basement, a recreation room, and a few meeting rooms. . . . The Theatre Group met there and produced a few plays.. an LYL club met there. . . . They were prepared to start a baby sitting service, Saturday Nursery for mothers who wanted to shop, and in general they could have planted some strong roots in the community. . . . . I because of my other activity not to busy in the group. . . . .

While working at the Workers Bookshop, I met George Stary, and Rudolph Halick both of the Czech Delegation to the United Nations. . . . . We became very good friends, and they used my to get Literature for them. . . . From the Volume of Literature, both Left and Right, that they bought and sent back to Czech., I would say that they had and are setting up a propaganda machine which they some day expect to use against us. . . . . Every one of the people who, I met was in my opinion doing a Propaganda Job. . . .and if there is a shooting war they will be in a position to use there knowledge. . . I took them around New York to various meeting of both the Party and the ALP. . . . . they were interested the our Support of the ALP, and wanted to know why we didn't put the Part forward. . .

I had my first contact with Peoples Artists at this Time. . . . They had working for them the same people who had run Peoples Songs, and the only difference in the Organization was the name . . . . . As state Literature Director of

the LYL I was responsible for the distribution of Party, and LYL literature to the members of the org. and to the contacts. . . . I was a member of the State Educational Committee . . . Sam Engler Was State Ed Director. . . . Our main job and the line followed along the same line as does the Party Line today; . . . We distributed the Stockholm Peace Appeal, Against the Draft, Free the 11 Party Leaders. . . . My work at the Workers Bookshop followed along the same lines as did that as State Literature. Director. . . . . As in all other organizations the Jefferson School Played an Important Part in the Organization and formation of an educational program. . . In the Fall of 1949 the school set up a Labor Youth League Nite. . . During this period I met with the State Committee of the League on questions of organization, and education. . . . Members of that Committee were Lou Diskin, Joe Bucholt, Sam Engler, Tarrentola, and Myself. . . . Other Leadres in the League were Bob Fogel Student Org, Leon Wofsey National Org, Roosevelt Ward NY County, Harry Bx County. . . Julie. . . National Org Sect. . . One day Lou Diskin called me and asked if he could borrow my car. He and Julie wanted it, and used it to transport a Mimograph Machine to an unknown destontion in preperation of the day of going underground.

This happened after the conviction of the Party Leaders at Foley Sq. . . . At the time that the Party Leaders Got out of Jail there was a Party held for them at the National Hq, 35 East 12st Street. . . . When the Party was over I was asked to drive Jack Stroebel to his home, on 94th Street. It was just before Christmas when I left my job at the workers Bookshop. . . . A typical Christmas in the Party was the one I had spent the Year Before. . . . It was a a Christmas day dinner at the Home of Claudia Jones, many people were invited because it was a fund raising affairs. . . . It was here that I met Ben Davis for the First time. . . . Also at the Party were Claudia Jones, Howard Streh Johnson. . . .

In February 1950 I was releived of the Job as State Literature Director, and assigned to work in the West Side Club of the LYL. . . . At the time I was living at 167 west 60th Street. . . . Club was small and not to active in the community. . . . Some members of the Club were Larry Weinberg, Lee Weiner, Phillis. . . . . At this time I was Also active in the American Newspaper Guild NY Local. . . . There is an anti Administration Force in the Local (Rank & File). The Rank and File is Party Run. . . . Harry Kelber, of Trade Union Press Leader Of Rank & File, . . .

In the guild the Rank & File disrupt meetings, and prevented aon a number of occasions the formation of policy which would have benifited the guild. . . . In July 1950 I left New York and went to New Mexico. . . . I spent a week at the San Cristoble Valley Ranch. . . . Owned and Operated by Jenny Wells Vincent. . . . She had beenidentified to my by Irw in Silber, Music Section Org as a Party Member. . . . I first met her and Her Husband Craig when they were in New York in December 1950. . . . San Cristobal is about 80 miles from Los Alamos. Many Party member who I know to be Party members were guests at the Ranch, and worked there. . . . ELMER BERNSTEIN, ERNIE LEEBERMAN, PEARL BERNSTEIN, EARL ROBINSON, JENNY WELLS VINCENT, CRAIG VINCENT, NEW MEXICO ORG. . . CLINT JENKS OF THE MINE MILL AND SMELTER UNION, ALEX AND LEE ENDE. . . . Howard De Sylva who had been cited by this committee was a guest there in the summer of 1950. . . . One of the sect. of the Czech delegation was there for two weeks. . . . There are in Taos New Mexico other people who are close to the party, Lou and Bea Riback were former party members in New York. . . . Bea Admitted this to be on a number of occasions. . . . They were also frequent visitors to the ranch. . . . I returned to New York in Nov 1950 for a visit. . . . While there Art Saha told me that I was up on charges. . . . I contacted Joe Bucholt and he set up a meeting. . . . I was expelled. . . . 19 January 1951. . . .

Senator EASTLAND. I want to ask you if this was your testimony which you have testified was under oath.

I testified in June 1954 before the Subversive Activities Control Board on both the cases of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

Mr. SCHERER. On all of those occasions you were under oath were you not?

Wait a minute, please, sir.

All right, now. I want to ask some questions and then I will ask you to keep that document, counsel, until we get through.

I ask you this question. All right now, Mr. Counsel.  
Mr. Matusow, Mr. Counsel:

I testified in June 1954 before the Subversive Activities Control Board on both the cases of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

Mr. SCHERER. On all of those occasions, you were under oath, were you not, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. In all of that testimony, did you state what was the truth to the best of your knowledge and belief?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I did not believe I told any untruths, at any time under oath.

Was that your sworn testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume so. The earlier part you started reading you were not quoting me.

Senator EASTLAND. I was reading your testimony.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you, sir. Yes, that was my sworn testimony before the House committee.

Senator EASTLAND. Was that testimony true or false?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I believe I said to the best of my recollection at that time. Referring to those two cases I did not know of any false testimony. However, I have since been able to reread that testimony and I have found some false testimony there.

Senator EASTLAND. In other words, you did not remember at that time whether or not you had committed perjury in your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think the record speaks for itself.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer my question, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not know at that time, that any of mine was false testimony, and I stated "I don't believe"—there was no definite affirmative or negative answer there.

(Consultation between Senator Welker and Senator Eastland.)

Senator EASTLAND. Now if a man has sworn a lie in court, do you mean to tell me that he cannot, a year or two later or six months later, he cannot remember whether or not he swore a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I had not slept for 2 nights almost when I got over there.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, you are asking me a theoretical question which I know nothing about.

Senator EASTLAND. You testified about Mr. Jencks; you have testified in that case when?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no recollection; it was, I believe in January, that is right.

Senator EASTLAND. January 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. This was the 12th day of July 1954. Is it or is it not your testimony that on the 12th of July, 6 months later, you could not, you did not remember whether or not you swore to a lie against Mr. Jencks but since you have read your testimony, and thought about it—

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, you have got two questions mixed up here—your preceding question dealt with my testimony before the Soviet and the Lincoln case; you are not talking about the Jencks case which was not the answer I gave.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir, but your answer included all of your cases, Mr. Matusow—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well—

Senator EASTLAND. In which you testified.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir, I know—

Senator EASTLAND. Your answer to a previous question—

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer is very simple. I knew on July 12, when I testified here in Washington, that I had given false testimony in the past. But I was not ready, willing, or able to admit that I had lied.

Senator EASTLAND. Except—

Mr. MATUSOW. That was a question of discussion with—

Senator EASTLAND. With Bishop Oxnam.

Mr. MATUSOW. That I considered privileged and that was another story involved there.

Senator EASTLAND. You did tell Bishop Oxnam that you had lied?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance, yes.

Senator EASTLAND. Against people?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance, yes.

Senator EASTLAND. Now I want to ask you if this is true:

Mr. SCHERER—

the next question—

Did you ever tell anybody that you had lied or told an untruth at any time during your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that is not the case.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I believe the way he phrased the question, I was splitting hairs with the Congressman from Ohio, I believe, Mr. Scherer. When he said did I ever tell anybody that I had told a lie or an untruth. I don't believe I ever used the phrase and that is why I was able to say, no. As I say I did not want to get into a fight with anybody. He said—if he had said in substance, I wouldn't have been able to answer that way but he didn't.

Senator EASTLAND. Now, was this your testimony:

In October 1952 I stated that there were X number of Communists on the New York Times. I do not want to state specifically how many now because I don't remember, as I said, what the correct figure is, to keep the record straight. When I gave the statement in October, October 28, in Los Angeles, Calif., I read where this statement was purported to be a retraction of my under-oath testimony, but the statement was not that. The statement I gave them was that I did not personally know the names of every member of the Communist Party. And when I gave a few speeches somewhere I referred to this, though I stated the correct figure to the best of my knowledge based on the facts, and my experience in the Communist Party, that because of—well, everything else I said, it might be and was construed and could have been construed, to mean something else, but that was just merely saying in a speech somewhere that this was a case and not that, but the fact that there were X number of Communists and my knowledge based upon my Communist Party membership and the experience—that I knew, and I do not retract.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, they said I had not slept for 2 nights. I think the answer is quite apparent.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what to answer.

Senator EASTLAND. You stated:

But that I knew, and that I do not retract—that—

there were X number of Communist Party members in the New York Times.

Mr. MATUSOW. I lost that somewhere along the line.

May I read the answer? It was quite incoherent to me, it seems quite apparent.

Senator EASTLAND. Was this your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was splitting hairs in relation to the term "retract" and "recant"; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, now, can you split hairs and say "I testified there were X number Communists on the New York Times" and "I do not retract it." Is that a hair splitting?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, when I said "X number of Communists" I did not put a number very deliberately as I recall.

Senator EASTLAND. That is correct. I see you recall it now.

Mr. MATUSOW. You just read it to me.

Senator EASTLAND. You did get the question, but you stated you did not retract that testimony, that statement.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is like I just said, I did not sleep for a couple of nights when I testified there and things I said under oath then were all based on the fact that I wanted to get out of this and get to bed.

I did not care what happened right then and there; I had worked 12 hours the day before, I just had flown up from Dallas, Tex., testified, had to fly back that afternoon and go to work that evening—

Senator EASTLAND. Just a minute, Mr. Matusow.

In those statements you testified that this testimony was false, that you had committed perjury then.

Will a man commit perjury before a congressional hearing, in order to go home and get some sleep; is that your testimony now, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know what I did before that, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. You have just answered it.

Mr. MATUSOW. You are asking me a hypothetical question—will a man—

Senator EASTLAND. All right.

Mr. MATUSOW. That I cannot answer that—I cannot answer for anyone but myself.

Senator EASTLAND. Did you do that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Did I?

Senator EASTLAND. Did you commit perjury in your testimony here in order to go home and get some sleep?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not admitting perjury—get one thing straight—I might say I told a falsehood but a point in question.

Senator EASTLAND. You testified that you lied, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. I gave false testimony; yes, sir. I lied; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Then you lied in this testimony in order to go home and get some sleep; that is your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I gave false testimony before that committee because I was just too tired to stand up and on my own two feet and look the committee members in the eye and say, "Look, I have lied before and you are partially responsible." That is all.

Senator EASTLAND. Now, was this your testimony in relation to this committee:

I have not given anybody any statements or said anything that would say I have lied under oath.

Of course, you were denying what Bishop Oxnam had said in the newspapers?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I was denying the statement, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. That is your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND (reading):

I have not given anybody any statements or said anything that would say that I have lied under oath.

You were saying then that Bishop Oxnam in his statement to the papers had lied on you, were you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I quite said—I think I went through a fairly long dissertation at that point, about the way the press reports, statements made by certain people, and I said I am almost sure the press reported Bishop Oxnam wrong and I give Bishop Oxnam the benefit of the doubt and presume that the press was inaccurate. I believe that is what I said in that testimony, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Well, sir, the rest of that answer is this:

I have told somebody. I found a stronger faith, and belief in God which I had before, but which is now more stable, and that I have had a very warm, and shall we say friendly, honest religious experience not in relation to any specific church. Yes; that I said, but that I say here and I will say again, but that does not detract or retract anything.

Mr. MATUSOW. From your quoting statements to me as if they were statements that I made in my sleep. You know—

Senator EASTLAND. I am quoting you, your full testimony, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir, I think the record is clear, and I do not want to be evasive. I want to answer the questions. But it is kind of hard to try and answer questions that were made when I was in a state of near sleep. I don't put much credence in any of that testimony.

And the question of where I lied or where I told the truth, sometimes I was thinking about a nice soft bed down in Dallas with a blanket pulled up over me and the air conditioning coming in, or, you know, just relaxing, and here I was sitting there. In fact, I came up to Washington, I did not even have—I had a pair of jeans on. Somebody had stolen my suit in the—at Carter Field, down in Carter Field in Fort Worth, and there I was with a pair of moceasins and blue jeans, and I found a pair of pants to wear, a jacket, and the shirt did not fit me right, and I had to borrow a tie. It was just kind of like a mess up there.

And you asked me what I said. I did not even want to get out of my blue jeans—wouldn't have shown respect to that committee.

Senator EASTLAND. What you are saying now is that the way you were dressed in blue jeans, would influence you to lie; that is it, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I was saying I was not in condition to get on the—

Senator EASTLAND. That is the logic of your answer, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Here we go again. All I am saying is that that testimony was kind of confused.

I admit that I said everything there outside of typographical errors.

The validity of what I said, I could sit down and point out to you certain points where I lied.

If I said in that testimony I never told a lie under oath then I was lying then; yes. I think that is quite clear, sir. I haven't denied that.

Senator WELKER. Sleep did not have anything to do with that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. As I said, I was just tired.

Senator EASTLAND. I want to ask you this question, sir?

Mr. CLARDY. Have you, at any time, told Bishop Oxnam that you have lied to this committee, or to any other committee, when you were under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not say and I do not say now, that I ever lied under oath. If I had lied under oath, I would have no qualms about saying so.

Mr. MATUSOW. But I lied when I said I did not lie.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes; that you lied when you said so.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. All right.

Mr. MATUSOW. I admit that.

Senator EASTLAND. That was 9 months ago; was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; we might say I became pregnant then with the truth and here it is, 9 months later.

Senator EASTLAND. Mr. Tavenner asked you this question:

It is important for the committee to recall, to make certain that your testimony was not in error before this committee in any respect.

Mr. MATUSOW. The first point before I get to either of them, my testimony was not in error. I refer again to the stability and instability which I hope I was able to clarify.

Mr. CLARDY. By that you mean that you were telling the truth, when you were before this and other committees?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes.

That was your testimony under oath, 9 months ago; was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. And you now state that that testimony was false?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; when I said I did not lie, I lied.

Senator EASTLAND. And you said you had been to Bishop Oxnam; you told Bishop Oxnam that you had lied on him?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance; yes.

Senator EASTLAND. You testified; yes, well—well, now, was Bishop Oxnam's statement to the papers true?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance.

Senator EASTLAND. That you had told him you had lied on all of these people?

Mr. MATUSOW. In substance, his statement was true; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. And you told the committee that Bishop Oxnam was lying?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never said Bishop Oxnam lied.

Senator EASTLAND. You said he was a completely dishonest man.

Mr. MATUSOW. Did I use the term "dishonest?" "Completely dishonest." I think I said I would call the Bishop a dishonest man, unquote.

Senator EASTLAND. A dishonest man, then. That means the same thing, does it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. My reference to dishonesty was the fact that he reported—

Senator EASTLAND. Now—

Mr. MATUSOW. He reported the conversation with me—it was privileged.

Senator EASTLAND. Wait a minute.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. In your testimony, you speak of the times when you were stable and at times when you were unstable.

Mr. MATUSOW. On the witness stand; yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir, and you tell the committee time and time again that your former testimony was made at a time that you were unstable.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. But you had had time to think about it, that you were now stable, that it had stability and that it did not have previously.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. And that you, in your period of stability, you were affirming everything you said.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; that is what I told the committee.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir. Now you are saying 9 months later that you were unstable and testified falsely at this time.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; 9 months ago is kind of like a rebirth and it is a wonderful thing.

Senator WELKER. I did not get that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Nine months ago—again it is like a rebirth again, I feel fine about telling the truth.

Senator WELKER. You have had more sleep.

Mr. MATUSOW. Plenty of sleep these days; nothing keeps me awake.

Senator EASTLAND. I want to ask you, sir, if this was your testimony:

Mr. CLARDY. At any time in your conversations with Bishop Oxnam, did the name "Un-American activities" creep into the conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; as did it before the other boards.

Mr. CLARDY. In connection with that matter, specifically referring to this committee, did you make any statement that would enable the bishop to go forth, and honestly say that you had lied to us, meaning the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Your answer to that was "No."

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't deny the answer, but I deny the facts in the answer.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes, sir. Well, in other words, you say that you were lying then 9 months later, 9 months ago?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I have said that how many times and still say it again.

Senator EASTLAND. Did this occur?

Mr. CLARDY. In the prior testimony, and I believe I was not present, you identified a considerable number of persons as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the figure is one hundred and eighty-some odd.

Mr. CLARDY. I haven't counted it up but I know it is a considerable number.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you make a false statement of a single one of those persons?

Mr. MATUSOW. I went over that list with a fine-tooth comb, shall we say, and in fact, as I recall, there were some names that were in doubt in relation to the

criteria I set up for identification at the time. I set up, and Mr. Appel can bear this out because we discussed it, the basis of identification was based on rules of evidence, even though I was not before a court, and was not bound by the court rules of evidence.

Mr. CLARDY. I wanted to make sure that there was no such error.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you testified before this committee, were you not advised and requested to omit any name in which there was any possible doubt in your mind?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I meant, sir. We did do that. We based the identification on rules of evidence.

That was your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, it was.

Senator EASTLAND. How many of those one hundred and eighty-odd people did you lie about?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea now. Excuse me, sir, but a number of them.

Senator EASTLAND. Any other questions?

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrogate this witness when we resume this afternoon along the lines that you have just finished, with respect to his being stable or unstable, his lack of sleep, and being out of his head, as he has testified about.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't think I said out of my head.

Senator WELKER. My interrogation will be brief. I am addressing myself to the chairman, if you please.

Mr. MATUSOW. You were quoting me, sir.

Senator WELKER. It will be very brief.

Senator EASTLAND. We will now recess until 2 o'clock.

(At 1:50 p. m. the hearing was recessed.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Present: Senators Daniel (presiding), Watkins, Butler, and Welker.

Also present: J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel; Alva C. Carpenter, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research, and Robert C. McManus, professional staff member.

Senator DANIEL. The committee will come to order.

Senator Welker, do you have some questions?

Senator WELKER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

#### TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW, ACCOMPANIED BY STANLEY FAULKNER, HIS ATTORNEY—Resumed

Senator WELKER. Mr. Matusow, as I told you yesterday, I didn't have the opportunity of being here when you were first interrogated by this committee. However, I have worked with your able counsel in executive session, and I hope that my questions will be to the point.

I am not seeking to embarrass or ridicule, but I must, with the duty that we have here representing the American people, try to get the facts as they exist, as we believe them to exist.

(Senator Butler entered the hearing room.)

Senator WELKER. Now, Mr. Matusow, you made some remarks this morning in your sworn testimony which rather shocked me. One I recall was that you were out of your head.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe that that statement was made, sir. I believe that is an incorrect quote.

Senator WELKER. Well, I will challenge the record because I wrote it down. If I am wrong, I certainly will be the first to apologize to you, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. And another one was in response to our distinguished chairman's interrogation; it was about the fact you were unstable because of the lack of sleep. As a matter of fact, Mr. Matusow—and I don't desire to embarrass—since 1953 you have been rather unstable, haven't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would say prior to 1953 I was more unstable than I was since 1953.

Senator WELKER. Well, you say something about lack of sleep. I have been trying to read your book for the last two nights, and you know how hard it is to read a book when you are trying to get facts from which to interrogate. I believe I have lost about as much sleep as you did before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. The record should show I haven't lost much sleep lately.

Senator WELKER. Well, I don't know how much sleep you have lost, but it is a fact you have done a good deal of traveling, and I realize that you have been in the public light, newspapers, and bothered more or less by those who desire your opinion and your statements.

Now, in August, I believe it was, 1953, in the second paragraph of your book, *False Witness* you stated this, and I quote:

Outside of my parents, I don't believe there was a person whom I felt I could call a friend.

Is that true?

Mr. MATUSOW. At that time, yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, what brought about that? You certainly had friends, with your personality.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, getting the matter, the question of the divorce I was involved in, and there are certain things there which I don't believe are matters which I should discuss. I have not discussed them in the book.

Senator WELKER. No, I don't desire to go into private matters.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. There will be some things with respect to marital differences that I must inquire about, and I hope this record shows I don't seek to embarrass or intimidate you at all.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir; thank you.

Senator WELKER. Have you ever physically assaulted any person, any place, in the last, say, 3 years?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Would you mind telling how many you assaulted?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. No, I don't mind. I actually do mind, but that deals with the marital relations again, and I am not going to justify the act. I hit my ex-wife the day we were divorced. I think I hit her with a full fist across the face, to be exact, sir.

Senator WELKER. You knocked her down in the streets of Reno?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; in a garage in Reno.

Senator WELKER. Well, in a garage in Reno?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. As a result of that lick, she was carried to the Riverside Hotel; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me, sir?

Senator WELKER. She was carried to her room, whether it be the Riverside or wherever you were staying?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, no, sir; she walked on her own power.

Senator WELKER. Well, you are a pretty husky looking boy. I don't desire to have you strike me.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't intend to, sir. I have gotten rid of most of my physical violence. I am not going to go into the reasons of why I decided to use violence then, but I will take the full responsibility for what my actions were.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Witness, you left the impression with me that that was more or less of—I don't know how to characterize it—an agreeable divorce action wherein you didn't contest it. She paid for—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, that was the second divorce. There were 2 divorces involved in this, sir.

Senator WELKER. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I don't think it was too agreeable on the first occasion. I finally did not contest it. In fact, I didn't even know she had gotten the divorce. That is one of the reasons I was quite disturbed.

Senator WELKER. Well, then, how did you tell me yesterday that you waived, you signed a waiver?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I had waived it, and we had reconciled after I had signed the waiver, and I thought the waiver was no longer in existence, and then I found out quite suddenly that my wife had gone into court in Reno, and without my knowledge gone before the Judge with the waiver I had signed prior to our reconciliation, and gotten a divorce.

Senator WELKER. And was the second divorce action that you struck your—

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that was the first divorce.

Senator WELKER. The first?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; August 25 is the date.

Senator WELKER. Of what year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1953.

Senator WELKER. 1953. Nothing, of course, happened as the result of that—no police action, no arrest, or anything of that nature?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I believe she hollered for somebody to call a policeman. The policeman came; she decided—

Senator WELKER. I didn't hear your answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. I say a policeman came but nothing happened. There was nobody there to present any charges. She got up and walked away.

Senator WELKER. Very well. I regret that I had to bring that matter into the controversy.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is a matter of public record. I believe an attorney for an organization I testified against brought that up in testimony in June of 1952—1954; pardon me.

Senator WELKER. Now, the second divorce was in 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; about 30 days after the first one.

Senator WELKER. Was there a property settlement made at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I believe I retained custody of our new Buick station wagon.

Senator WELKER. That is the new Buick station wagon?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; that is what I retained custody of.

Senator WELKER. Did you sue your wife for \$20,000?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not quite; because the amount of money involved there was the amount that she had in a note which I had given her when we got married the second time, which said—I gave her a note for \$20,000, and the \$20,000 involved in that suit was just for me to retain that note.

Senator WELKER. Would you pull your microphone up. I am having difficulty—

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, I gave her a note for \$20,000; and when I sued her for divorce, and dropped that action, by the way, I wanted that note back, and not cash for \$20,000, but the note.

Senator WELKER. And what did you use the \$20,000 for?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I might say when we were married I was living high on the hog.

Senator WELKER. High on the hog?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you soon dissipated that, I take it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, quite easily; yes, sir. We did, that is.

Senator WELKER. That was after the breakup of the marriage, however, that you sued for cancellation of the note?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. But I dropped that suit—the record should show that—and signed a waiver.

Senator WELKER. Now, am I correct, Mr. Matusow, when I ask you whether or not it is a fact that you did not sue your wife for the cancellation of the \$20,000 note, but you did sue her for damage to your reputation?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, the way in which I was going to sue and get that note canceled is something which might include that, but the State of New Mexico has certain laws, and I tried to file the action, as such, but my intent—you asked me my intent, and that was my intent.

I don't know what the newspapers reported and what the actual petition in the court read, but I knew what my intent was, and that is what I am testifying to this morning.

Senator WELKER. Your attorney advised you how to sue to cancel the note; did he not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't want to raise the question of my attorney. The attorney at that time, there is another story involved there.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, of course, you realize that these matters are matters of public record.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't deny this, sir; but you were asking me my intent and what I did.

Senator WELKER. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. And I have explained that to you.

Senator WELKER. But the complaint happens to go to a court of law, states your intention better than what you can state it as before this subcommittee; isn't that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think the wording of the complaint that went into the court of law in Santa Fe, N. Mex., was there quite ap-

parent, and I say it speaks for itself, but if I had gone to that court of law asking for a cancellation of that note just because I wanted the note canceled, I am sure nothing would have happened. That is what my attorney advised me.

Senator WELKER. Well, as a matter of fact, why were you worried about the note? You didn't have any money, she couldn't collect anything from you. She couldn't collect the \$20,000, could she?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I just wanted the note canceled, have a clean slate. We were separated. We were separated, we were going to get divorced, and I wanted no strings, that's all.

Senator WELKER. I thought this was after the last separation.

Mr. MATUSOW. No. This was after—well, the day after the last separation.

Senator WELKER. Well, that's right.

Now, isn't it a fact that in your complaint or your petition in the State of New Mexico when you sued your wife, one of the allegations, the important allegation of that complaint, happened to be that you charged the defendant, your ex-wife—

Mr. MATUSOW. Who was then my wife.

Senator WELKER. No, no; I thought you said you had gotten a divorce the day before.

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, no, sir. We were still married at that point. Let's get the record clear.

Senator WELKER. All right. Whether you were married or not, is it not a fact that you charged her in your complaint or petition for the \$20,000, that she had damaged you to such an extent that you could not support yourself in the decent and respectable manner to which you had become accustomed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have said that. I haven't got the petition in front of me, but it is very possible.

Senator WELKER. And you had to swear to that, didn't you, under oath? It was a verified petition or complaint?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. But again I reiterate, and I would like the record to show, that matters pertaining to my ex-wife and myself, dealing with our marital relationship and what goes on in the contesting of a divorcee, sir, you, as an attorney—and I presume you have handled some divorce actions in your career—

Senator WELKER. A couple.

Mr. MATUSOW (continuing). Understand that certain material goes into petitions being filed for divorce which gives an impression, which is not the true impression, but is necessary in order for the courts—I mean, I don't want to go into all the details of it, but I think an action which is for a divorce might be considered similar to what is said in the heat of a political campaign between two candidates who could be friends afterward and before.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Now, when you sued for \$20,000, you certainly weren't suing for divorce, were you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe there was a divorcee involved, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, I thought you told us—

Mr. MATUSOW. A divorce action involved; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. The action was part of a divorce action.

Senator WELKER. I thought you told us that you filed and sued for divorce not once but twice in the State of Nevada.

Mr. MATUSOW. No; my wife filed those suits. I filed in New Mexico.

Senator WELKER. So you countersued, did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. She countersued in Nevada after I had filed in New Mexico, after we had agreed to get a divorce. It was a question of who was going to get there "fustest with the mostest."

Senator WELKER. And that was the grounds of the divorce, that you weren't able to support yourself in the manner to which you had become accustomed, and asked for \$20,000 from your wife?

Mr. MATUSOW. I told you what I was asking for, and I told you what the \$20,000 was.

Senator WELKER. I am sure that you have, and I regret that I have had to ask you about these matters that I try not to go into, because, had it not been a public record, I assure you I wouldn't have gone into it.

Now, I would like to ask you a few things about—

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Senator WELKER. Will the record show the consultation.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you, sir.

(Senator Watkins entered the hearing room.)

Senator WELKER. Yesterday I interrogated you with respect to some of your finances. Let me again ask you at this time, are you a wealthy man?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you have money in the bank?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, a few dollars.

Senator WELKER. All right. What do you mean by "a few dollars"?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I don't know what the figure is now. Money which I spent on this trip.

Senator WELKER. You don't have that in the bank, the money that you spent on the trip?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. I mean, that would come from money I have taken from the bank account. I would say right now total cash assets, a couple or \$300; I have got royalties coming in from a toy which I invented, which is going to be on the market in a few weeks; a toy that I invented and sold to a manufacturer last year. I expect to make five, six, maybe ten thousand dollars on that toy. I have got another toy.

Senator WELKER. I don't desire to go into the toy.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I mean, I do other things besides write books and become a witness.

As I say, I have got one toy that I have already sold, and another one which I expect to have sold shortly, which would be for next year's toy fair.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Now, as I understand the testimony given by you prior to my returning from the West, you stated that you had been robbed in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., of the sum of \$1,100 in cash?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And I am informed that you had this \$1,100 in the leaves of a book.

Mr. MATUSOW. In a book; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Where and when did this robbery take place?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the exact date, but I believe it was the last day of September, or thereabouts, in 1953, in the Hollywood-Roosevelt Hotel in Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Senator WELKER. Did you report that to the robbery division?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it was reported immediately.

Senator WELKER. And they made an investigation of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I presume so. They came up and inquired in good Dragnet fashion, and they got the facts.

Senator WELKER. But you didn't get your money back?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you file income-tax returns?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Did you list that as a loss?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you care to submit to the committee your income-tax returns for the last, say, 6 years?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I will dig them up, and the committee can have them.

Senator WELKER. I would appreciate that. That is very gracious of you, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will get you copies of it. I believe at this point I am in the process of preparing last year's income tax, and when that is completed, if I may do it after April 15, which is the date I file income tax for 1954.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Matusow, have you ever earned large salaries?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. What is the largest salary you ever earned?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, very seldom worked on salary. The largest amount I earned from a corporation—usually, I have worked in the past as independent contractor. You might say that 1 day's work for the Texas Pacific Railway, of \$800, was pretty good for a day's work.

Senator WELKER. \$800?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. That is all listed in your returns?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. That included expenses. I believe it is all itemized.

Senator WELKER. Well, certainly.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You are entitled to that. That is the highest?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, offhand I can think of that as an example, and there were other examples of moneys earned, similar to that, during the election campaign.

Senator WELKER. What is your average income?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, it varies, sir.

Senator WELKER. That is a pretty broad answer. Can't you help me a little better than that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't have an average income. My life hasn't been average either, and I think my income has been commensurate with the nonconformity of my activities in the last 5 or 6 years.

Senator WELKER. Your life hasn't been average?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I wouldn't call myself a conformist in relation to the average John Q. Citizen who goes to school, gets out, and works for somebody for 10, 12, 15, or 20 years.

Senator WELKER. Now, I would like to ask you this: Who has your toy contract?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, a friend of mine has it. I will get all the contracting information for you.

Senator WELKER. I would like to know the name of the friend of yours.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I will have to decline to answer that question right now, until I can get the specific name of the company. It is being handled by somebody else, and I will get that.

Senator WELKER. You mean, if you don't know the name of the specific company, that you would have to decline under the fifth amendment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Wait a minute, sir. I didn't say anything yet, but let me answer this question.

Senator WELKER. Very well.

Mr. MATUSOW. And then we will get to the point. Because of the fact that I am a fairly controversial individual, and that I have created something which has nothing to do with politics, in the way of a toy, and was sold to a manufacturer under a name, my stage name, and the fact that if it were known publicly—the press is here—that this toy was a product of my doing, I think it would affect the sale of it and would interject something in the sale, normal business sale, of this toy, which would not normally be there.

It is an entertaining, nondestructive toy, for children, and therefore if I were to disclose that at this point, I feel it would affect not only me but the manufacturer who has invested a certain amount of money in this toy; and would therefore be unfair to that person who has invested this money, and I think that point is clear. I am trying to make it clear, sir.

Senator WELKER. It isn't quite so clear, because I want to advise you that, as one member of this committee, we are not here trying to make the manufacturer money.

Mr. MATUSOW. Are you trying to lose it for him?

Senator WELKER. Nor are we trying to lose money for him, but we are seeking only one thing: that is the truth.

Now, I will ask you to name me the name of the individual or the corporation or the partnership who has the contract on your toy.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator WELKER. A truthful answer, in other words, to that very simple question would tend to incriminate you, or set in force a chain of circumstances that might tend to have you bear witness against yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. There are other aspects to the fifth amendment to the Constitution which, I think, would cover that, sir.

Senator WELKER. I am not asking you for that. I am trying to help you, and I think that is a perfectly legitimate—

Mr. MATUSOW. In the fifth amendment, may I quote, sir?

Senator WELKER. No: you are not going to make a speech. I have heard it 10,000 times.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER. I know the fifth amendment perhaps as well as you do, and if your counsel differs with me upon my philosophy of what the fifth amendment means, in order to protect your rights, you have every liberty to protect them, but I don't want to hear the ordinary speech that I have heard here so many, many times.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is not the question of incrimination.

Senator DANIEL. Let the Chair—

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be directed and ordered to answer the last question with respect to who the individual happens to be, the corporation, or partnership, or any other body, known to be the contractor on his toy.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, the Chair orders and directs you to answer the question asked by Senator Welker.

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

(Senator Watkins left the hearing room.)

Senator DANIEL. The record will show the consultation with counsel.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the rights in relation to the fifth amendment, as to the fact that no property can be taken or disturbed in any way without due process of law, and I feel that disclosing the name of the manufacturer, et cetera, would, in effect, be taking property from that manufacturer and have an effect on the sales of that toy.

Senator DANIEL. You understand that you have been ordered and directed to answer this question?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And that you may lay yourself liable for contempt of this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand that.

Senator DANIEL. If you continue to refuse to answer it, do you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. On that question, I am fully cognizant of that, sir, and I maintain my position, and also the fact that counsel informs me, and I know it—I asked him about it—I believe this has no relevancy with any of the issues involved here, but mainly the question of the property, due process of law in relation to the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and I maintain that.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I should like to be heard for just a moment so that the record may speak clearly.

I am afraid the record may not now show whether Mr. Matusow is claiming the fifth amendment privilege or some other privilege in connection with his last refusal to answer.

I respectfully suggest that he be directed to claim whatever privilege he desires explicitly in connection with his refusal, so that the record may speak on that point, and I believe in fairness to Mr. Matusow, he should be admonished on the record that he does not have the right to refuse to answer under the fifth amendment because of fear that some other person will be embarrassed or caused loss thereby, or because of fear that he himself will suffer financial loss thereby.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, I feel sure that your lawyer will so advise you, if you counsel with him, that the reasons which you have given there in your last refusal are not applicable under the fifth amendment.

Now, the Chair is going to order and direct you again to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Then I can simply state, sir, that I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the protection afforded me by the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, Mr. Matusow, in all truthfulness, you know that you are not actually in good faith declining to answer that question on account of any fear that it is giving evidence against yourself or might tend to incriminate you, don't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the grounds in the full comprehension of the fifth amendment cover my answer, sir, and that there is something in the fifth amendment to the Constitution which was set out to protect me and other individuals in such cases.

Senator DANIEL. Just to make it clear that you understand what you are doing—

Mr. MATUSOW. I do, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Do you have any fear that a truthful answer to that question will in any way tend to incriminate you or cause you, yourself, to bear witness against yourself for something—

Mr. MATUSOW. There is more to the fifth amendment than that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I just ask you—will you answer that question—do you have any fear that a truthful answer to that question could in any way tend to incriminate you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I believe the answer in relation to the fifth amendment is an answer in itself to that question. If I had fear one way or another about self-incrimination, that would be the reason that I invoked the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. I just want to be sure that you counsel with your conscience and with your counsel—

Mr. MATUSOW. My conscience is quite clear, sir.

Senator DANIEL (continuing). Before you refuse for the third time to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I state my position, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is it your position—

Senator DANIEL. Excuse me 1 minute.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am referring to myself, not somebody else, sir.

Senator DANIEL. So that we have an explicit answer here, is there any fear in your mind that a truthful answer to this question would tend in any way to incriminate you directly or indirectly with any offense or in any offense, for which you could be punished?

Mr. MATUSOW. My only answer is that I invoke the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and the rights contained therein, where it says: "nor to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Senator DANIEL. You decline to answer, then, the last question, too, for the same reason?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is it your opinion and the opinion of your able counsel, should I ask any of the newsmen or any person in this room what company they might own one share of stock in, that that would tend to incriminate the man?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have no idea what any newsmen or any members of the committee, or anybody else in this room, might be guilty of or innocent of, and why and when they would—

Senator WELKER. You are not inferring that you are guilty of anything, are you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I said "guilty or innocent of."

Senator WELKER. Guilty or innocent of?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Certainly, if you are innocent, then you couldn't bear witness against yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. Ah, sir, the fifth amendment is there to protect the innocent as well as the guilty.

Senator WELKER. I understand that. I have heard that many times before.

Mr. MATUSOW. And it is true.

Senator WELKER. Now, would you be kind enough to answer this very simple question—

Mr. MATUSOW. I will endeavor to do so, if possible.

Senator WELKER. Have you received any royalties from this toy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe, sir, I am going to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and the rights contained therein.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, the Chair orders and directs you again to answer the question which has been propounded, and I want to say, so the record will be clear, that you have not satisfied the chairman of your good faith in claiming the fifth amendment as a ground for declining to answer the question which has just been asked, and if you will counsel with your attorney again and think this matter over, at least I hope you will, and that you realize that at least this committee is going to see that a witness is in good faith and is using the fifth amendment in good faith before this committee is going to permit him to decline to testify without again ordering the witness to testify.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you, sir.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Senator DANIEL. I want you to know that what I have just said applies to both the question Senator Welker asked you, the last question, and to the last question which I propounded to the witness.

Now, what is your answer to Senator Welker's question?

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer to Senator Welker's question is that I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and the rights contained therein; and in relation to your question, sir, as to my good faith in answering that question and using the fifth amendment to the Constitution on this question, I believe that I am in good faith with the committee, and I know I have been in good faith with this committee in answering all questions propounded to me by members of the committee and able counsel for the committee, and I intend to continue to answer such questions; and I believe of all the witnesses that have been before this committee, who might be considered unfriendly witness, as I think the press has termed me, I think in terms of using and invoking the fifth amendment I have probably set a record for not doing so, and have done so at a minimum only in relation to the testimony in Texas, which we went into this morning, and this question today.

I have not hedged, I don't believe. I have been answering your questions. I understand that I have left myself open to certain criminal action in relation to contradictory statements under oath, on not

1 but probably 500 or 600 occasions, in the 4 days that I have been before this committee, and I don't believe I am trying to avoid all types of answers which would tend to incriminate me, as you put it, but I think in this case, sir, my using the fifth amendment to the Constitution is in good faith, and I sincerely believe that any answer I might give to these questions would be something I could not answer because of the fifth amendment; I feel that I must invoke the privileges and rights afforded to me by the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. You understand you are using the fifth amendment to protect the manufacturer of your toy; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. No. Excuse me, sir. Primarily to protect me.

Senator DANIEL. I order you again and direct you to answer the question I asked a moment ago, just for the sake of the record, so it will be clear that you have been ordered to answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That is, as to whether or not you have the slightest fear that a truthful answer to the question that Senator Welker had asked about who was to manufacture your toy would tend to incriminate you or cause you to be punished in any way.

Mr. MATUSOW. The answer to your question, sir, I must decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, and the rights contained therein.

Senator DANIEL. All right. I just want the record to show that the committee has warned you over and over again that the committee does not believe that you are in good faith in invoking the fifth amendment on this question, and if you should be cited for contempt later, it certainly will not be without warning from the acting chairman of this committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am cognizant of it, sir. Thank you for advising me.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine has a question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Just one question at this point, Mr. Matusow.

Is the firm which is to manufacture, or which is manufacturing your toy a Soviet or Communist firm?

Mr. MATUSOW. Before answering that question, which I will endeavor to do without invoking the amendment, I want to find out from my counsel whether or not by answering that question I am waiving my rights to the fifth amendment on the other questions. Excuse me.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Senator WELKER. Do you care to describe the toy

Oh, I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. Wait a minute, Mr. Witness, the chairman desires—

Senator DANIEL. He is about to answer a question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, but not on that question in relation to my own dealings with all types of manufacturers.

I might state I have had no contact with any Soviet concerns at all in the last—in any time that I can recall in my life, or any behind the Iron Curtain concerns, but it has nothing to do with the last question, mind you, sir, but I have never had any contact with any manufacturers behind the Iron Curtain.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, you certainly waived any immunity you might have on that question, and the Chair is going to order and direct you to answer that question, again with the warning that you may cause yourself to be liable for contempt of this committee if you insist on declining to answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I am cognizant of the warning of the committee, and appreciate that, but I must decline to answer the counsel's last question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine, will you repeat the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. And may I at the same time further admonish the witness, Mr. Chairman?

Senator DANIEL. You may.

Mr. SOURWINE. The admonition to the witness is that, having testified under oath that you have never had any contact with a Soviet or Communist firm, it is obvious that your answer to my question, if truthful, would have to be, "NO", and it is equally obvious that a "no" answer could not in any way incriminate you so that if your testimony here is true, you would appear to have no basis for claiming the fifth amendment.

The question is whether the firm which is manufacturing or is to manufacture your toy is a Soviet or Communist firm.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, you are directed and ordered to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I must decline to answer that question put to me by the counsel, on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Senator Welker?

Senator WELKER. Now that leads me to this. I think all of us are rather interested in this toy. Could it be a miniature lie detector?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, on the question of lie detector, I said yesterday, but it wasn't picked up; I want to take a lie detector test, but not a miniature—

Senator DANIEL. Just a moment, Mr. Matusow. Answer the question propounded, please, sir. It calls for a yes-or-no answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, no; it is not a miniature lie detector.

Senator WELKER. I didn't hear your answer.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is not a miniature lie detector.

Senator WELKER. Would you mind telling us what sort of a toy it is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I call it a stringless yo-yo.

Senator WELKER. A stringless yo-yo?

Mr. MATUSOW. A stringless yo-yo.

(Senator Butler left the hearing room.)

Senator WELKER. And once again, repetitious as it is, if you tell us the name of the manufacturer of the stringless yo-yo, it might tend to have you bear witness against yourself?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe in answer to that question I would have to invoke—I mean, to tell you the name of the manufacturer, I would have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Is he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I will have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, because by answering that question would waive my rights to the other privilege I have of invoking the fifth—

Senator DANIEL. I order and direct you to answer the question whether or not the manufacturer of your yo-yo is known to you to be a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. Senator Welker?

Mr. MATUSOW. I will be glad to send each member of the committee a version of it, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Just a moment. Senator Welker has a question, I believe.

Senator WELKER. I want to ask you again, whether I have heretofore or not, has anyone ever handed you a substantial sum of money, say, from \$500 on up?

Mr. MATUSOW. Businesswise or gamblingwise, or what?

Senator WELKER. I don't care what it is; businesswise, gamblingwise, or otherwise.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, there have been times in Nevada when I have cashed in chips to the amount of 2 or 3 or 4 thousand dollars.

Senator WELKER. What year was that, sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1953.

Senator WELKER. 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. When I was married; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you recorded that on your income-tax return?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, the money was lost, probably within the next day or so; but did somebody hand me 2 or 3 or 4 thousand dollars, and did I give it back to them the next day is another question, sir.

Senator WELKER. That was income, though, just the same.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I was advised by my accountant that if I won money in the morning and lost it in the afternoon I hadn't made any money, that same money.

Senator WELKER. Now, you in Nevada hit a lick, as they call it out there, for from 2 to 4 thousand dollars?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think I once ran about eight passes in a row on a table.

Senator WELKER. Eight passes in a row?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; making 8 and 6 the hard way. Once in a while I got lucky on it, got lucky once and bet \$25 or \$20 on 12, and that came in. I think that paid 30 to 1.

Senator WELKER. 30 to 1?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Would you say it was closer to \$4,000?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't remember. I used to gamble quite a bit up in Reno with my wife. We gambled a lot up there.

Senator WELKER. You are putting "we" into it. I am asking you.

Mr. MATUSOW. We were partners in gambling, we were together at the dice table, and we played dice together.

Senator WELKER. And you want to say now that you didn't report that gambling within—

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't win money at gambling. I didn't say that. I said on a day or so I might have hit a hot lick, but I am not talking about the times I crapped out on the table.

Senator WELKER. Where did you get the \$1,100, stolen from you in Los Angeles?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I testified to the fact that part of it was expense money that the New York Times had sent me in order to fly to Los Angeles and see their Los Angeles correspondent, and part of the money was gambling winnings.

Senator WELKER. The New York Times sent you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; that is in the record.

Senator WELKER. As I say, I missed the first portion of your testimony. When did this happen?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the date, but a day or two prior to my going to Los Angeles.

Senator WELKER. Well, when was that, if you would help me?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, in September; September 28 or 29, maybe the 27th.

Senator WELKER. Of what year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1953, sir.

Senator WELKER. 1953. And that is after the time that you had named all these so-called Communists who were working on that great paper?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And they asked you, notwithstanding that fact, to go to Los Angeles to be their New York correspondent?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. May I get the record straight?

Senator WELKER. Well, certainly.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right. I called the New York Times from Reno, Nev., and said, "I am Harvey Matusow, and I want to give you a statement, correcting or clarifying the charges I have made against the Times. I don't want anything for it. I just want to clear my conscience. Would you have your Reno or your San Francisco man come out and see me here in Reno."

I was informed by the man I spoke to at the Times that nobody could get there, but I had to go to Los Angeles, if I would, and see their Los Angeles man. I said, "Yes, I will go to Los Angeles if you will furnish me with expense money to go there," and they said, "All right," and that is the story.

Senator WELKER. And it cost you \$1,100 to go from Las Vegas to Los Angeles?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I think I said they sent me \$300.

Senator WELKER. Oh, I beg your pardon. I asked you where you got the \$1,100.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said the balance was won in gambling.

Senator WELKER. Oh, yes.

Now, I had recently brought to me the complaint you filed against your wife, being filed in the district court, the first judicial district, County of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, No. 26116, and I will ask

you, Mr. Matusow, whether or not this is a correct statement and a correct reading of the complaint you filed against Arvilla P. Matusow:

Comes now the Plaintiff, by his attorney, Edwin L. Felter, and for his cause of action against the Defendant, says and alleges:

1. That Plaintiff is now and for more than one year last past and next preceding the filing of this Complaint, has been a resident in good faith of the State of New Mexico and now resides in Santa Fe County of said State.

2. That the parties hereto were married on the 4th day of September 1953 at Santa Fe, New Mexico—

Are you listening?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am listening, sir, to every word you say.

Senator WELKER. I don't want anything to miss you. I want to be fair, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. I am listening to you, believe me.

Senator WELKER. And then when I get through reading, then you can have all the time you want.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator WELKER (continuing) :

and became and have ever since been and now are husband and wife.

3. That no children have been born as a result of the union in marriage between the parties hereto and none is expected.

4. That the community property of the parties hereto consists of one 1953 Buick Estate Wagon and one 1946 Nash 4-door sedan.

5. That the Defendant is a person of great financial means and influence and by virtue of her position as such, and as a direct and proximate result of the wealth and influence of said Defendant, said Defendant, through pure malice arising out of and growing out of this and a previous marriage between the parties hereto has maliciously damaged and destroyed various items of personal property being the sole and separate property of this Plaintiff, and has maliciously damaged the reputation of this Plaintiff to such an extreme point that it has become virtually impossible for this Plaintiff to earn a proper living and provide for his own care and support upon any decent or respectable scale of living to which this Plaintiff was accustomed prior to this and a previous marriage unto the Defendant herein; that by reason of the premises aforesaid, Plaintiff is justly, equitably, and lawfully entitled to a settlement of and from said defendant in lieu of alimony in the sum of Twenty Thousand (\$20,000) Dollars.

6. That Plaintiff and Defendant are incompatible; that due to differences in temperaments and dispositions and due to defendant's aforesaid malicious conduct, destroying and damaging personal property of this Plaintiff and damaging his reputation to such an extent that Plaintiff can no longer earn a decent and respectable living, the parties hereto have been unable to live together in peace and harmony as husband and wife and Plaintiff is entitled to an absolute divorce of and from the Defendant upon the grounds of incompatibility.

7. That said Defendant should be restrained and enjoined from in any manner molesting this Plaintiff or from approaching his place of abode during the pendency of this cause or until the further order of the Court herein.

Wherefore, Premises considered, Plaintiff prays as follows:

1. That he be awarded an absolute divorce of and from the Defendant upon the grounds of incompatibility.

2. That Defendant be restrained and enjoined from in any manner molesting this Plaintiff or from approaching his place of abode during the pendency of this cause or until the further order of the Court herein.

3. That the Court make an equitable and just division of the community property of the parties hereto and award unto this Plaintiff the sum of Twenty Thousand (\$20,000) Dollars in lieu of alimony.

You were the plaintiff, your wife was the defendant, and you are seeking \$20,000 in lieu of alimony.

4. For all just, necessary, and proper relief in the premises.

Signed by your attorney, Edwin L. Felter, Salmon Building, Santa Fe, N. Mex. And then:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

*County of Santa Fe, ss:*

HARVEY M. MATUSOW, being duly sworn upon (his) ~~her~~ oath, deposes and says:

That (s)he is the Plaintiff in the above-entitled cause; that (s)he has read over, knows and understands the contents of the foregoing complaint and that the statements therein made are true of (his) ~~her~~ own knowledge, except those statements that are made upon information and belief, and as to these (s)he believes them to be true.

s/ HARVEY M. MATUSOW.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of September, 1953.

[NOTARY SEAL]

s/ CLAUDIO S. SENA,

*Notary Public (Commission Expires 3/30-54).*

Now, is that the complaint that you—

Mr. MATUSOW. Excuse me, sir.

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

Senator WELKER. Let the record show the consultation.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I made the affidavit.

Senator WELKER. Now, I am not going to belabor this matter. I will introduce as part of the record the complaint that I have heretofore read, and I will leave the other matter to counsel.

Senator DANIEL. The complaint will be received and filed for the record.

(The document was marked "Exhibit No. 25" and placed in the subcommittee files.)

Senator WELKER. And is a part of the record.

Senator DANIEL. And is a part of the record.

Senator WELKER. Have you, Mr. Matsu—

Mr. MATUSOW. We are in the Formosa Strait again.

Senator WELKER. There I go again.

Did you ever receive, Mr. Witness, any money directly or indirectly from any newspaper other than the New York Times?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I was once employed by the Amsterdam News in New York. I received pay there.

Senator WELKER. What year was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1950. And, oh, let's see now, Counterattack.

Senator WELKER. Do you remember how much you received from them?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget, offhand.

Senator WELKER. How long did you work for them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Four or 5 months. And, let's see now, I received money from Counterattack, that was a newspaper or newsletter.

Senator WELKER. Counterattack; we went into that yesterday.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. And I think I once sold a story to Drew Pearson.

Senator WELKER. To whom?

Mr. MATUSOW. Drew Pearson.

Senator WELKER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. A newspaperman. I have gone into that in Judge Dimock's court; public record.

Senator WELKER. How much did you receive from Mr. Pearson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I think I got \$200 or \$250 recently for appearing on his television show in November 1954. And I believe I received

a couple of hundred dollars once for selling a story or some information for a story to the New York Post. My recollection is vague on that one. I would have to check back on that.

Senator WELKER. The New York Post?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, the New York Post.

Senator WELKER. Now, going back to Mr. Pearson; you received, say, \$200 or \$250?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Was that in the form of cash?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Is it a fact that you later went back to Mr. Pearson and told him that you would like that to appear in the form of a loan?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I forgot about that one, sir. Two occasions, I received money from Mr. Pearson.

Senator WELKER. Let's have both of them, and I want the whole story.

Mr. MATUSOW. The first one was when I sold Mr. Pearson a story, a very sneaky way that I did it, too.

Senator WELKER. What?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I was a sneak when I did it, because I was playing both ends against the middle. I sold him the story of how I had taken a prospective witness for the Hennings committee out of the country, so that witness, who also was my former wife but not at the time, would not be brought before that committee and embarrass Senator McCarthy and herself.

You see, the committee had records showing that she had given Senator McCarthy \$7,000, but Mrs. Bentley, who later became my wife, told me that she gave the Senator about \$70,000.

Senator WELKER. Seventy thousand?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and she didn't want that to become public record.

Senator WELKER. I see.

Mr. MATUSOW. And we skipped the country.

Senator WELKER. Then by virtue of that, you were guilty of some sort of law, weren't you, trying to obstruct justice?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I don't know how much obstruction there was of justice, but I was an accessory to the fact, I guess, yes.

Senator WELKER. Well, I would think you certainly were.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was, and Senator McCarthy was, and J. B. Matthews was, and Joseph A. Rafferty was; and even the United States attorney here in Washington was, a law partner of Mrs. Bentley's lawyer, Leo Rover, knew about it.

Senator WELKER. How much did Mr. Pearson pay you for that yarn?

Mr. MATUSOW. He paid me, I think, \$225 or \$250, but I have since, and Mr. Pearson has agreed to accept that amount as a loan, which I will pay him back. It makes me feel better.

Senator WELKER. You went to Mr. Pearson and asked that all these cash considerations be considered as a loan?

Mr. MATUSOW. That one in particular; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, I will ask you if it isn't a fact that your movement, your activity with respect to that, was solely because of the fact that you wanted to evade the income tax?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; that is not so.

Senator WELKER. You didn't want to list it on your income-tax return?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; you are wrong; you are so wrong.

Senator WELKER. Why did you want to pay him back this money?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I had a guilty conscience about selling him the story, in the first place.

Senator WELKER. I see.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know if you understand what conscience is, sir, but I have learned to understand what conscience means.

Senator WELKER. We are going to go into conscience a little later. I believe I have a little idea of that. I think I have had a number of people on the witness stand equal, perhaps to the number of times you have been on the witness stand, and they have had some conscience, too, and I want to be as fair with you as the prosecutor or the interrogators were with people that I happened to be representing.

Mr. MATUSOW. I appreciate that, sir.

Senator WELKER. Have you at any time, directly or indirectly, received any money or consideration from a radio or television broadcaster or a commentator other than Mr. Pearson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, outside of work which I did as a performer on television or radio in capacity of an actor, disk jockey, or something like that; no, sir.

Senator WELKER. That is the end of it. No one else paid you a dime?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge. If I think of one, sir, I'll tell you.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, we are going to do our thinking now. You are under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. I can think of none right now, sir.

Senator WELKER. Yes. Well, that isn't an answer. You would certainly know if anyone, a columnist or broadcaster or anyone else on any television or radio program, gave you any money other than Mr. Pearson, you would remember that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would try to remember it, but I can't remember any now.

Senator WELKER. Can you remember?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. You wouldn't say they didn't?

Mr. MATUSOW. To the best of my recollection there is none other.

Senator WELKER. Now, this morning you made some statements that I took notes of, and again I don't want to embarrass you. You stated at one time, and I challenge the record, that you were out of your head. Another time you said you were stable and unstable, and that, I think, was in the year of 1954, when you appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee. These responses were made when you were interrogated by our chairman, Senator Eastland, of Mississippi.

Mr. MATUSOW. He interrogated me this morning about my appearance on July 12.

Senator WELKER. That's right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you said because of lack of sleep, you made some statements, lack of sleep of 2 days, I think you said.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I hadn't slept in about 2 days, and part of the attitude I had before that committee was due to the fact that I wanted to go to sleep and not testify; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And part of the explanation, for repetition, was because of the fact that someone had stolen your suit of clothes, you wore a pair of blue jeans, and some moccasins.

Mr. MATUSOW. Something like that; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And that caused you then to give the testimony that Chairman Eastland—

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I think the reason I gave the testimony I did, the main reason—the others were subordinate reasons—the main reason is stated quite well in the book, if you would like me to read it into the record.

Senator WELKER. I have spent more than two sleepless nights trying to read your book, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. It reads quite fast.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. It reads quite fast, sir.

Senator WELKER. It reads quite fast, but when I am thinking of trying to get the facts I think our committee owes to the American people, I read rather slowly.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you, sir.

Senator WELKER. On page 230 of your book—and again I may have the wrong notation—

Senator DANIEL. While Senator Welker is looking for that, I would like to get it clear as to the date that you gave Mr. Pearson the story about taking Mrs. Bentley out of the country.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I gave him the story about the first of the year, in or about the first of the year, in 1952. In fact, it might have been Christmas Day or Christmas Eve, or a few days thereafter.

Senator DANIEL. 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. It might have been a day or so after the first of the year.

Senator DANIEL. When did he pay you the \$250?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe it came in about that time.

Senator DANIEL. In 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Now, did you report that \$250 on your income tax?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so.

Senator DANIEL. Well, why did you later go to Mr. Pearson and ask him to carry it on his books as a loan instead of a payment?

Mr. MATUSOW. Conscience.

Senator DANIEL. Conscience?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, isn't the truth about it that you had failed to report it on your income tax and asked him to carry it as a loan so that you would not be liable for any conviction on your income-tax return?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I have no recollection of that. If I hadn't reported it on my income tax, I should have reported it, and the fact that I asked him to make it a loan, if I didn't report it, I am thankful that I did because of my conscience therefore that I am not guilty of

fraudulent income-tax filing. But if you are informing me of something I don't know, I am very grateful to you, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Just this last year you got \$250 more from Mr. Pearson?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't filed that tax yet.

Senator DANIEL. For appearing on his—well, you don't know what question I am going to ask you, do you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Well, suppose you wait until I ask the question.

Now, last year you received \$250 more from Mr. Pearson for appearing on his television show, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Did you take the cash?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I cashed a check at—is it the Riggs National Bank down at Wisconsin Avenue and M Street?

Senator DANIEL. You didn't apply it on the loan that he was carrying on his books?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I discussed it with him, and he said "No, not right now. You take this." It wasn't cash, by the way.

Senator DANIEL. Have you ever repaid the loan of \$250?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, not yet.

Senator DANIEL. Was it a loan or was he paying you for the story?

Mr. MATUSOW. I told you, sir; I told the committee and I told Judge Dimock's court that I originally sold it as a story, but I later, long before I wrote this book, by the way, went to Mr. Pearson and asked him if he would consider it a loan, and he agreed to do so.

Senator DANIEL. But you have not paid him the money back?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator DANIEL. You received the money in payment for the story?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Now, Mr. Witness, page 226 of your book, and I quote the third paragraph thereof, allegedly written by you, Mr. Witness—

Mr. MATUSOW. Not allegedly, sir. Written by me.

Senator WELKER. Well, that is subject to a little difference of opinion, but we will go into that, maybe at a later date.

Mr. MATUSOW. Let's hope so.

Senator WELKER (reading):

I was driving on the road between Reno and Las Vegas. As I sat at the wheel of my Buick station wagon, a feeling of depression came over me. The miles slipped by and the minutes droned on. All I could do was think of myself and how useless I was. I was friendless and wifeless. I decided I would commit suicide. I made up my mind that I would hit the accelerator of that car and as I watched the speedometer climb, 90, 95, 100, I said to myself, I'll just keep this car on the road and at the first turn I come to I won't turn. I don't know how far I traveled or how long it took, but I soon hit a rabbit, killing it instantly. As I felt the thud of the rabbit going under the wheels of my car I suddenly snapped out of it. I brought the car to a stop and backed up for what seemed almost a mile to the point where the shattered remains of the rabbit lay. I got out of my car there in the desert and just stood looking at the rabbit.

By the time I got back into my car, I no longer intended to kill myself, and I was thankful that the road on which I had been driving was flat and straight as it cut through the Nevada desert.

That is a correct statement, is it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I wrote that, yeah; hearts and flowers.

Senator WELKER. Was it the truth?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, very much so.

Senator WELKER. You were a bit unstable at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was a bit disturbed.

Senator WELKER. And that was brought about by the fact that you had lost your wife and that you had also been what you call a stool pigeon?

Mr. MATUSOW. A lot of it was brought about because of the pressures at certain committees that had caused in the United States upon people like me as a witness—

Senator WELKER. At that time you were driving along, you dedicated yourself to the fact that never again would you appear on a witness stand against any of these people?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I decided I had a pretty useful existence, being a witness and a stool pigeon, yes, sir. It was kind of a useless existence lying on the witness stand, attacking people.

Senator WELKER. You said "useful existence."

Mr. MATUSOW. I said useless existence; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. But it took the little rabbit to bring you out of the trance you were in?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, I don't like killing anything.

Senator WELKER. I realize that. For a long, long time you didn't hesitate, according to your story, sending innocent people to the penitentiary where their Christmases were not just as white as yours were, and where they heard that lock, you know, and where they served for as long as 5 years, or maybe longer.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I am kind of thankful right now that one person who I helped convict hasn't been in the penitentiary, and the fact that my testimony was the testimony that convicted him should set a new trial for him, and in relation to those other people, that is up to the courts.

Senator WELKER. That is the case we got into this morning.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. If you desire to argue that matter, I will turn it back to the Chair.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. When you ducked all morning about that matter.

Mr. MATUSOW. All I am saying, sir, you are trying to leave the impression here I have had a lot of lies in my testimony, but leave the impression that hundreds of people have gone to jail and a lot of people are behind locked doors because I sent them to jail.

I potentially could have sent them to jail if I continued in this role, sir, but I am glad and I thank God that I didn't.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that out on the Nevada desert when you were not so emotionally stable you wanted to commit suicide, yet you were dedicated never to be another stool pigeon, a rabbit saved you from committing suicide, but it didn't take you very long, did it, Mr. Witness, to come back again before congressional committees, quasi-judicial bodies, and testify under oath to your God against these people that I like to call unfortunate people.

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't come back to any congressional committees except that one occasion before the House committee. Let's talk about the type of testimony now, sir. I went before judicial bodies.

Senator WELKER. Will you answer the question. You didn't hesitate long after hitting the rabbit?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; I slipped, sir. I went back to testify.

Senator WELKER. Now, directing your attention to page 2330 of your book—

Mr. MATUSOW. Two thousand three hundred and thirty? Two hundred and thirty, sir.

Senator WELKER. Two hundred and thirty. I can't even read my own writing, sir. Let's go to 229 first, the last paragraph.

Mr. MATUSOW. The last paragraph, 229.

Senator WELKER (reading):

I returned to New York to the home of my parents and here went into hibernation for the winter. I wanted to be alone with my thoughts. I thought I would be able to do this in the one place in the world where I knew I had love. Shortly after my return to New York I was sitting in a bar drinking—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You don't drink any more, according to your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I stopped drinking.

Senator WELKER. You have reformed?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have never been a drunkard.

Senator WELKER. What were you drinking down in that bar?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I could drink a lot of scotch at one time, but it never bothered me; just put weight on me.

Senator WELKER. All right. Now, continuing the quote:

sitting in a bar drinking, feeling sorry for myself. I turned around and there behind me was a wall mirror. I was shocked by what I saw. I saw a fat and sloppy young man, sitting on a bar stool. His clothes weren't pressed; he needed a haircut; and his backside covered the bar stool and dropped off at the sides.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is a good reason, sir.

Senator WELKER (reading):

I told myself "You're fat and sloppy. You're physically sloppy and mentally sloppy."

I weighed 230 pounds, and that's fat for a man who's only 5 foot 8. I went home that evening and decided that what I needed was discipline, the kind of self-discipline that I had never allowed myself to accept. The kind of self-discipline that if I had had I never would have been a witness.

I put myself on a diet. I lost weight, looked better and felt better. I sat at my typewriter writing poetry. I started to find answers to some of my own questions.

Then again when you saw yourself in the mirror you dedicated yourself to never again be one of these vicious stool pigeons, the lowest rung of the ladder, as you have written in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. You didn't quote that, sir, quite correctly. I think, taking that book in context, I think in that chapter you are reading from, I deal with the question of how I stopped being a witness. It took stages. It didn't come about in 1 day or through 1 incident, but it took a number of days and a number of incidents.

Senator WELKER. I am inquiring about when you saw yourself in the mirror. Once again you dedicated yourself that you would never again be a stool pigeon?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think you are reading something into that that doesn't exist.

Senator WELKER. Is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; it is not quite right.

Senator WELKER. Shortly thereafter, then, you certainly dedicated yourself to never again being a witness, a stool pigeon?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, look—

Senator WELKER. Answer the question. Did you or didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Shortly thereafter? This is shortly thereafter, and this is true.

Senator WELKER. Very well. All right.

Now, what was the date of this when you saw yourself in the mirror?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, about a year ago.

Senator WELKER. About a year ago.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. But notwithstanding the fact that all of this happened a year ago, just 9 months ago, before the House Un-American Activities Committee, you made the statement that Bishop Oxnam was a dishonest man and, with the strongest, smartest language I have ever heard a witness use on the witness stand under oath, especially when he had lost 2 nights' sleep, you again reiterated the fact that you told the solemn truth from beginning to end. Is that or is it not a fact?

Mr. MATUSOW. That I testified on July 12?

Senator WELKER. You heard the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. There seemed to be 2 or 3 questions in there, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, you answer 2 or 3 of them. I am sure you followed me.

Mr. MATUSOW. I followed you part of the way, but I lost you somewhere near the end of the road.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that you had seen the man in the mirror a year ago, sick and tired of being the bottom rung of the ladder, being a professional stool pigeon, a name that you hated, and as you admitted to me yesterday, you used it because you wanted to get even with the Air Force—

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, you are taking things out of context again, sir.

Senator WELKER. I take them out of context—I have heard that, too, but if you read your book, you can take a few things out of context, too.

Mr. MATUSOW. But I don't want to. I want to tell the truth.

Senator WELKER. All right. Now, you just follow me now.

Notwithstanding the fact that this happened 1 year ago, you had no reluctance whatsoever after calling Bishop Oxnam a dishonest man, to go before a congressional committee, raise your hand to God, and testify that you had told the truth from beginning to end in all of your appearances before congressional committees or quasi-congressional committees.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, at that time, sir, just chronology to correct you, I believe you said after I told Bishop Oxnam—after I called him a dishonest man I went before that committee. Before that committee I told the committee he was a dishonest man; that is, to be chronologically correct.

Now, in relation to the fact that I went before that committee—yes; I went before that committee, and I even lifted my hand and swore that I was telling the truth, and I hedged and I hawed, and I told the truth for the most part, but I told a few falsehoods.

I admitted that this morning, I admit that today, I admit that in my book, and I will admit that tomorrow. I have nothing to fear by admitting the truth today. The fact that I lied yesterday was yesterday. The lies of yesterday have taught me how to tell the truth today. I know that, whether you do, sir, or not, is very unimportant to me at this point because I can live with myself.

Senator DANIEL. I think the only thing you might have to fear as to yesterday is proof that you were telling the truth in your previous testimony and are not telling the truth now, Mr. Matusow, and if I may interpose here, I will say that from the evidence you have given in the past, which is corroborated by other people, it would appear to me that that is what you have to fear: Proof that you were telling the truth previously, but are not giving this committee the truth under oath at these hearings.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I am fully cognizant that some action might be brought against me for statements I have made under oath, either in the past or today, and am fully cognizant of what they might be, some of them, and I am ready to take on any fights or battles that are brought my way, and I am going to base everything I do on truth, and I think I am going to come out on top, regardless of where I go and stay.

Senator WELKER. You think you are going to come out on top. This morning I thought I understood you, and correct me if I am wrong—in response to a question by the acting chairman, Senator Daniel, of Texas, you stated that you would admit that you lied, but you wouldn't admit that you had committed perjury.

Mr. MATUSOW. That's right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you tell me why you wouldn't admit that you committed perjury? When a person tells a lie under oath, that, in my book, is perjury.

Mr. MATUSOW. That, in my book, is a lie, that's all.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't like the term.

Senator WELKER. You don't like the term "perjury"?

Mr. MATUSOW. No.

Senator WELKER. You do like the term "liar"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think it's better, more descriptive; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. More descriptive?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. There could be another reason.

Mr. MATUSOW. Could be. I don't deny that, sir.

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't deny there could be another reason.

Senator WELKER. Well, now, do you want to tell me that you not only lied but committed perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I lied. I told falsehoods, I told half-truths, mistruths. Perjury? I don't know what the word means.

Senator WELKER. You don't? You seem to be pretty well educated, but I am quite certain that your counsel could tell you, if you would lean over there, tell you very quickly what the word "perjury" means.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not that curious.

Senator WELKER. You are not that curious?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Now, on page 231 of your book, and without reading it, I am sure you will follow me—will you pay attention to me?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I know every word you said. "On page 231 of my book, and would I follow you without reading it."

Senator WELKER. You not only said that you are looking for Christian charity, you wanted to repent. You stated:

Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you want to say that you have done that?

Mr. MATUSOW. That I am doing that today, doing justly, love mercy, walk humbly with thy God? I am doing that; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You think you are doing justice to the manufacturer of your toy? You think you are being merciful to that man who might be just as innocent as anyone in this hearing room?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I am concerned about myself in relation to that toy.

Senator WELKER. Oh, well, but after all, this applies to not only the manufacturer but the witness—do justice, love mercy, walk humbly with God.

Mr. MATUSOW. The correct quote is "do justly," not "justice." "Do justly, love mercy, walk humbly with thy God."

Senator WELKER. Fine. When did you learn that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I learned it as a child, forgot it as a young adult, and learned it again last year.

Senator WELKER. And you have forgotten and remembered several times.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir. I forgot many of the basic principles of the Lord's teachings, which I have relearned, and that is why I am doing what I am today.

Senator WELKER. I am wondering this: How am I to assume, Mr. Witness, that you might not forget again 6 months or a year from now?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, that is not your position; that is the position of God himself.

Senator WELKER. Oh.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, I happen to be representing the sovereign State and doing a job, which isn't a pleasant one.

Mr. MATUSOW. But, sir, our representation of God is equal, regardless of what your office is or what my position may be.

Senator WELKER. You should have done a retake on your statement a long, long time ago.

Mr. MATUSOW. I agree with you, sir.

Senator WELKER. Before you were testifying about these men who are serving terms in penitentiaries throughout this Nation, because, in my book, as a man who was once a prosecutor and was once a defense attorney, there is no more low character in the history of the world than a man who commits perjury and sends a fellowman to the penitentiary.

Mr. MATUSOW. Why do you encourage it?

Senator WELKER. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. Why do you encourage it, sir?

Senator WELKER. Have I ever encouraged you to commit perjury or tell a lie under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, you encourage witnesses like Elizabeth Bentley and Paul Crouch and the others to come before these committees and tell many lies.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, we are not going to have a repeat of yesterday afternoon on this subject. You will answer the questions that are asked you, that are propounded by the members of the committee, and not bring in these other people.

Senator, are you through?

Senator WELKER. No, I am not through because of that last one, which shows the inside pitch that the witness can throw, making a blanket accusation.

As a man who tries his best to represent his sovereign State and the Nation, you say that I have encouraged Elizabeth Bentley to tell lies, commit perjury, without even knowing that I never have had Elizabeth Bentley on the stand in my life. Such a vicious, foul accusation.

Now, don't you admit you had better go back to your profound statement : "Do justice"?

Mr. MATUSOW. "Justly," sir.

Senator WELKER. "Love mercy"—

Mr. MATUSOW. "Do justly."

Senator WELKER. "And walk humbly with God"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe in that.

Senator WELKER. Shortly after making that statement in your book—and it was a profound statement; I hope and pray that all Americans could be governed by it—you stated again on the same page that you slipped again and you testified shortly thereafter in two different cases.

Mr. MATUSOW. That's right, sir; I did slip.

Senator WELKER. It didn't mean very much to you then, did it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was in the process of growing.

Senator WELKER. Well, it was in the process of growing—the process of growing, that just now you accused me of encouraging Elizabeth Bentley to commit perjury and lie under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir—

Senator WELKER. And when you accuse me, you accuse these other members of the committee that I am honored to serve with, and never have I seen in the 2 years—better than 2 years—that I have served on this committee, even the remotest attempt of an investigator or one member of this subcommittee to encourage any man or woman to testify falsely.

I don't like that kind of testimony, and they don't like it out West, and I am certain red-blooded Americans don't like it any place.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't like it, either.

Senator WELKER. No.

Well, then why did you say that I had encouraged Elizabeth Bentley to testify falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was referring to the committee. I believe she testified falsely.

Senator WELKER. Now, you are going to do another shift.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. Can you name me one time? Yesterday in interrogation you had to admit that you had no evidence whatsoever that this committee ever encouraged Elizabeth Bentley or anyone else to testify falsely?

Mr. MATUSOW. This committee has encouraged Elizabeth Bentley to testify, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you asked it to be stricken from the record; is that not a fact?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, this committee has encouraged Elizabeth Bentley to testify. In my opinion, on the basis of conversations with Miss Bentley, seeing her emotional instability, I believe that she has lied under oath, and whenever she is brought before a committee and is not challenged on the statement she made, I believe it is the job of this committee to challenge some of the statements Miss Bentley made.

Senator WELKER. I am quite certain that that has been done, not once but many, many times, and, as far as I am concerned, now no longer in the majority of this committee, I would like to have Elizabeth Bentley and Paul Crouch and the others that you have maligned, like you did the junior Senator from Idaho, regardless of whatever propeller pitch you want to put on it, I would like to have them in the courtroom to face you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like nothing better, sir.

Sir, may I humbly suggest that I undergo a lie detector test, and also Miss Bentley undergo one. I am willing. Miss Bentley, Mr. Crouch, Mr. Budenz, Roy Cohn, or anybody else—lie detector tests, or any other scientific means of determining the truth in this case, I am willing; let them come forward and say they are.

Senator WELKER. Then on page 232 of your book, and I will soon end my interrogation, you stated that you were going, in substance now, and I hope I correctly state the substance of the matter of your book, that you had the first steady job of your life in Dallas; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. The first steady job in a long time.

Senator WELKER. In a long time in Dallas?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that's it; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. In many years, I think you said.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. And then shortly thereafter—and at that time you were through with congressional committees?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; that's right, sir.

Senator WELKER. Well, what caused you then again to come back before congressional committees?

Mr. MATUSOW. A subpena.

Senator WELKER. A subpena?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Would a subpena make any God-fearing man commit perjury or lie under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. It made you; didn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It did at the time, but it doesn't any more.

Senator WELKER. No, of course not. Why did it make you lie under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I was afraid of the committee.

Senator WELKER. You were afraid of the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. You are not afraid of this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not afraid of any man now, sir.

Senator WELKER. You are not afraid of any man?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. And you weren't afraid of the House Un-American Activities Committee, when they called you back to clarify the news release given by Bishop Oxnam, when you went profoundly at length into the fact that you were more sure than ever—

Mr. MATUSOW. May I answer that—

Senator WELKER. Now just a moment. You answer the question—that you were more sure than ever that you had told the truth and that you were factually correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. The testimony I gave then speaks for itself.

Senator WELKER. I think that is true.

Mr. MATUSOW. I think we are off the air.

Senator WELKER. Why, do you want to be on the air in particular?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, but I thought maybe you did not hear me.

Senator WELKER. I heard you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I thought the mike was off.

Senator WELKER. I have no more questions.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, you have maligned several people here again this afternoon and have alleged again that members of this committee encouraged you to lie. Yesterday afternoon you said you wanted such statement to be withdrawn; that you did not mean to leave that impression and I just want to ask you again, Do you today wish to leave that impression that any member of this committee encouraged or asked you to tell an untruth before this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not mean to say that a member of this committee encouraged me or was personally responsible for it, but the context of my statement—

Senator DANIEL. That is the answer I wanted to get now, yes or no, you do not mean to imply that any member of this committee encouraged you to lie or asked you to lie before this committee, do you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; but in the past the committee as a whole and the function of the committee somewhat caused me to do so.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now, that is your opinion. No member of this committee though sought you to do that, did they?

Mr. MATUSOW. No.

Senator DANIEL. Now first when you broke with the Communist Party was in 1951, wasn't that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; well, I left the Communist Party the first and only time that I was in the Communist Party on January 19, 1951.

Senator DANIEL. Now you wrote down all of your experience in the Communist Party, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I wrote down on more than one occasion, well—

Senator DANIEL. Before ever testifying before a congressional committee did you not write down all of your experience in the Communist Party and with the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. I'm going to have to decline to answer that question on the same grounds that I gave this morning, referring to any documents I wrote and gave as reports, on the basis of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Senator DANIEL. Well, now—

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman—

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to submit for the consideration of the committee that the witness, having testified to the effect that he wrote down on many occasions statements about what he had done in the Communist Party, has waived the privilege against testifying with respect to any of those statements.

Senator DANIEL. I think that the counsel is right, Mr. Matusow, and I am going to order and direct you to answer the question whether or not you have, of your own accord before testifying before any congressional committee written down your experience in the Communist Party and with the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. Might I ask the chairman, prior to answering that—of course I want to consult with counsel, but I lost part of a tooth today and I want to take some medicine. May I have about a 3-minute recess, and I will consult with counsel.

Senator DANIEL. We will have a 3-minute recess, and in talking with your counsel I would like for both of you to understand that the reason for this line of questioning is simply to make it clear in this record that you volunteered all this information about the Communist Party and your knowledge of the Communist conspiracy before any congressional committee ever saw you.

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That was the purpose of it. All right, a 3-minute recess.

(Short recess.)

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, do you recall the question that was asked just before the recess?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would appreciate it if the specific question were asked again.

Senator DANIEL. Is it true that after you first broke with the Communist Party and before you ever testified before a congressional committee, that you wrote out a statement of your experiences in the Communist Party and your knowledge of the Communist conspiracy?

Mr. MATUSOW. A statement—I am going to have to decline to answer that question—you are referring to a specific statement—

Senator DANIEL. Yes; the first that you ever wrote. I just said did you write a statement, any statement before ever appearing before a congressional committee outlining your experiences with the Communist Party, your knowledge of the Communist conspiracy? I understand that you have already testified that you did.

Mr. MATUSOW. This might be the case, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I just want to make it plain it was before you were ever brought before any congressional committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall testifying specifically about that, any statement, any specific statement before the committee. I may have.

I recall testifying about a specific statement in other hearings in Judge Dimock's court, I think I might have referred to that, but I don't recall testifying about any specific statement in this hearing,

sir, and I am going to have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Senator DANIEL. Well, I am going to ask you; I am going to direct and order you to answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Once again, sir, I am going to have to decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Senator DANIEL. If you find you have testified concerning such statement—

Mr. MATUSOW. A written statement?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; or otherwise waived any rights that you have to claim the fifth amendment in this instance, you understand that you might be doing something that would work to your own injury by declining to answer this, do you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my knowledge, sir, I have not waived any rights to invoke the fifth amendment on this question.

Senator DANIEL. I just wanted to call it to your attention.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Before you decline to answer other questions on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MATUSOW. In relation to any written statement referred to in the questions I am going to have to decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Senator DANIEL. All right, did you make any voluntary statement of any kind concerning your experience in the Communist Party and your knowledge of the Communist conspiracy before appearing before congressional committees?

Mr. MATUSOW. Did I make any statements oral or written?

Senator DANIEL. Yes; voluntary.

Mr. MATUSOW. Any at all?

Senator DANIEL. Voluntarily?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, I might have—well, I was just checking on the waiver procedure here. No, I did make oral statements to congressional investigators prior to my testimony, sir, and to Air Force investigators.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, as I said yesterday, I am a new member on this committee, but I do not like to see this committee and other committees of Congress maligned by you with statements that members encouraged you or led you directly or indirectly to testify falsely before these committees without making it clear for the record that you yourself before ever appearing before any committees of Congress wrote all of the information out yourself voluntarily before you ever appeared before a committee of Congress, in which you said just what you later told the committees of Congress about the Communist Party and the members that you identified. Now that is the reason for my question.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And will you with that reason being explained to you, in all fairness to this committee and other committees of Congress—are you willing to answer that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And let the record show that you did make such voluntary statements?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I will answer that question.

Senator DANIEL. All right, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Very specifically I state categorically now that no member of any committee of Congress, no investigator of any committee of Congress at any time to my knowledge—and in fact I will state, at any time—coached me or in any way coerced me to make any false statements under oath or otherwise, that is in relation to committees. In relation to statements I made in the political campaign—

Senator DANIEL. Now I am asking you only about committees.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Let's stop right there. I am glad you have that answer, although it was not responsive to my question. I still want to know if you did not voluntarily write out all of your experiences with the Communist Party, that you later testified about to Congressional committees, before you were ever called before a congressional committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. I did make oral and written statements to the House Committee on Un-American Activities before I testified and they were familiar with those statements.

Senator DANIEL. Yes; and you drew those yourself, those statements, did you not, before you ever saw an investigator for the House Un-American Committee, didn't you have a written statement made up?

Mr. MATUSOW. Partially before and partially after.

Senator DANIEL. Partially after?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And that investigator did not put any words in your mouth or encourage you to put any lies down, did he?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; and I didn't at any time intend to leave that impression.

Senator DANIEL. Yes, sir. Now, then, the information that you put in this statement of October 19, 1951, a statement which has been released here after having been placed in the record by the chairman today, of 22 pages, that statement was written by you, was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. SOURWINE. For the record, Mr. Chairman, I think it should be stated that this statement is 22 pages in a mimeographed draft which has been made available here, but the carbon copy of an original which the witness this morning refused to identify and which went into our record is a 71 page statement.

(Mr. Sourwine said later:)

For the record, I am still worried about the accuracy of it. I would like to ask the Chair to instruct that the statement I am about to make be printed at the same point in the record as my previous statement with respect to the 71-page and 22-page documents. It should be made clear that the 22-page mimeographed document, single-spaced on legal sized paper, is the same in text, including typographical errors, as the 71-page document, which actually went into the record—the difference in length of pages is because the former document was on letter-sized paper and double-spaced.

Senator DANIEL. The statement will be included in the record as requested.

Senator DANIEL. Yes: with reference to the 71-page statement in the original, that was written by you, was it not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and protection afforded me therein.

Senator DANIEL. Now with respect to your appearance before the Texas Industrial Commission, I think that is pretty evident and clear, but I just want to be sure the record is clear, was there anything that the Texas officials had or anyone else in connection with this hearing, any knowledge that they had that you think should have led them not to ask you to appear as a witness there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea, sir. If I understand your question, I believe that certain statements that I made under oath before this committee such as the day in March 1952, that I said I could identify 10,000 Communists by sight, certain statements and accusations I made against the New York Times, Time magazine, should have led people not only in the State of Texas but before committees to say well—what kind of a witness am I?—but other than that, sir, there was nothing that should have led them to believe that I was not a—

Senator DANIEL. You put on a pretty good act down there in Texas, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. They would have been sort of foolish not to have believed your testimony, wouldn't they?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am not trying to accuse any member of the attorney general's staff in the State of Texas for being responsible for what I said. They didn't know about it. They had a general idea that I was going to testify and in no way coerced or coached me for testimony.

Senator DANIEL. You don't attribute the slightest bit of criticism to them for taking your evidence at this hearing at full value, do you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know; you are pointing to a document there. I think the record is clear on my position on that, sir. Not talking about the document but—

Senator DANIEL. Talking about the hearing.

Mr. MATUSOW. My appearance in the State of Texas at the invitation of the attorney general was one in which if any falsehoods were told, if there were any, they were my responsibility, and no way reflect upon the members of the staff. I don't want to reflect upon the members of the staff of the attorney general of the State of Texas.

Senator DANIEL. Sure. As a matter of fact you know full well that you had given the same evidence at other places and that much of this evidence could be corroborated. You had given an earlier statement in 1951 and you had given statements to the FBI which were directly in line with what you gave the Texas commission; isn't that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. This is quite possible, but as I said this morning, sir, I have not read the Texas commission. I presume so. Not until I have read that report would I make any definite statements about it, but I believe, sir, that in inviting me there, the members of the staff of the attorney general and the attorney general himself based his invitation upon prior testimony of mine before other groups.

Senator DANIEL. Yes. No one encouraged you to lie or to testify falsely before the Texas commission.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't say I testified falsely there. I don't say one way or another, but nobody encouraged me to testify falsely, if I did testify falsely.

Senator DANIEL. I think you told the committee the truth from my observation of you for several days, and you don't deny now—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't deny nor do I confirm, sir. I have no comment on it until I have read it.

Senator DANIEL. Yes. Now then, when you went out to El Paso to testify in the Federal court against Clinton Jeneks, did anyone force you or encourage you to lie, to bear false witness there?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I stated in this record before this committee, United States Attorney Charles Herring, assistant United States attorney there, Hovey Williams nor Assistant United States Attorney Joseph Alderman, the 3 men whom I worked with, none of the men had any responsibility for the testimony that I gave. I presume they accepted all my testimony in good faith, believing it was true.

Senator DANIEL. It seems to me you have cleared the congressional committees and the Federal court officials in El Paso and the Texas commission, all agencies which have used your testimony, and I appreciate your answer that you have given on that. Now Senator Welker had another question.

Senator WELKER. Yes. If counsel for the witness will bear with me, I interrogated briefly a moment ago about the petitioner's complaint for divorce filed in New Mexico.

To save time I didn't put into the record the other certified copies of the motion of a release and a dismissal with prejudice which is all of it, as you know, that is the end of the divorce action, and I would like, Mr. Chairman, to have these additional documents marked in evidence to follow the complaint, particularly directing the chairman and the committee's attention to the fact a general release given by the witness on the \$20,000 claim in lieu of alimony against his wife for the sum of \$10 and other good and valuable considerations.

Now I think in fairness I should send this down to counsel, let him look at it, and I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the record following the divorce complaint which I interrogated about a moment ago. Here is the divorce complaint. I think you should hand them all to counsel.

Senator DANIEL. Did you receive this \$20,000?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. The action was dropped voluntarily on my part.

Senator DANIEL. Did you receive any money from the judgment?

Mr. MATUSOW. \$10 referred to, I think. I think I received counsel fees of \$200. My wife paid counsel fees in Reno for divorce and I received title to a brand new car which was assessed at maybe \$3,500 or maybe \$4,000.

Senator DANIEL. Is that all you received?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is fees—counsel fees, et cetera.

Senator WELKER. That is all?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think that was the amount I received, a few hundred dollars.

Senator DANIEL. These instruments will be received in evidence and made a part of the record.

(The complaint referred to was read into the record at p. 387 by Senator Welker. The motion to dismiss was marked "Exhibit No. 26" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 26

STATE OF NEW MEXICO, COUNTY OF SANTA FE, IN THE DISTRICT COURT

No. 26116

HARVEY M. MATUSOW, Plaintiff, vs. ARVILLA P. MATUSOW, Defendant

MOTION

COMES NOW Arvilla P. Bentley, formerly known as Arvilla P. Matusow, and designated as the defendant in the above entitled cause, by her attorney, Henry J. Hughes, appearing specially and solely for the purpose of this Motion, and moves the Court to dismiss this said cause of action with prejudice upon the ground that this Court has never acquired jurisdiction of the defendant in this cause, and that thereafter, to wit, on the 29th day of September 1953, the said parties were divorced in the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Washoe, in Cause No. 147998, being entitled Arvilla P. Matusow, Plaintiff vs. Harvey M. Matusow, Defendant; that prior to the entry of said Final Decree divorcing said parties in the State of Nevada, the said defendant therein being the plaintiff herein agreed to dismiss this cause of action with prejudice, all as shown by copy of agreement signed by the said Harvey M. Matusow attached hereto as Exhibit A.

WHEREFORE, your defendant prays that this cause of action be dismissed with prejudice.

s/ HENRY J. HUGHES,  
Attorney Appearing Specially for Defendant.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Motion was personally served upon Edwin L. Felter, Esquire, as attorney for the plaintiff herein, on October 21, 1953.

—  
s/ HENRY J. HUGHES.

EXHIBIT A

GENERAL RELEASE

*To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come or May Come, Greeting:*

Know all men by these presents that I, HARVEY M. MATUSOW, of Santa Fe, New Mexico, for and in consideration of Ten Dollars (\$10.00) and other good and valuable considerations, to me in hand paid by ARVILLA P. MATUSOW, do by these presents for myself, my heirs, executors and administrators, remise, release, and forever discharge ARVILLA P. MATUSOW, of Reno, Nevada, of AND FROM any and all manner of actions, cause and causes of action, suits, debts, dues, sums of money, accounts, reckonings bonds bills, specialities, covenants, contracts, controversies, agreements, promises, trespasses, damages, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, in law or in equity, with against her I have had, now have, or which my heirs, executors or administrators, hereafter can, shall, or may have, for or by reason of any matter, cause or thing whatsoever, from the beginning of the world to the day of the date of these presents, including, but not by way of limitation, a certain action for divorce which I filed against her in the State of New Mexico a short while ago, and which action I agree to dismiss in its entirety without cost to her.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of September, 1953.

s/ HARVEY M. MATUSOW.

Witness:

s/ MORGAN ANGLIM.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO, COUNTY OF SANTA FE, IN THE DISTRICT COURT

HARVEY M. MATUSOW, Plaintiff, *vs.* ARVILLA P. MATUSOW, Defendant

ORDER DISMISSING CAUSE WITH PREJUDICE

No. 26116, Rec. Bk. 10 P. 120

This matter having come for hearing before the above entitled Court upon Motion heretofore filed by the defendant's attorney, said attorney appearing especially for this Motion only, and the Court being fully informed in the premises,

It is therefore ORDERED that the above-entitled cause be dismissed with prejudice.

At Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 22nd day of October 1953.

S/ DAVID W. CARMODY,  
*District Judge.*

O. K.

S/ EDWIN L. FELTER,  
*Att'y for Pl.*

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

*County of Santa Fe, ss:*

I, Susie M. Montoya, Clerk of the District Court within and for the above County and State, do hereby certify and declare that the above and foregoing seven (7) pages of typewritten matter constitutes a true, correct, and complete copy of Complaint, Motion, and Order Dismissing Cause With Prejudice, in that cause entitled HARVEY M. MATUSOW, *vs.* ARVILLA P. MATUSOW, Defendant, No. 26116 on the Civil Docket, as the same remains on file and of record in my office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this the 28th day of February 1953.

SUSIE M. MONTOYA,  
*Clerk of the District Court.*

Senator DANIEL. How long did you live in New Mexico?

Mr. FAULKNER. Did Senator Welker wish me to make any statement on these?

Senator WELKER. No; I just thought in fairness to you, you might want to look at the instruments.

Mr. FAULKNER. I have looked at them. And, of course, I feel they are wholly irrelevant to these proceedings and, apparently, any objection I might make would not be acceptable to this committee.

Senator DANIEL. How long have you lived in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. On or off, sir, since 1950. Total time varied—I haven't computed all of the time, even at times when I didn't live there—at times I kept a residence there.

Senator DANIEL. How long had you lived in New Mexico following this divorce action?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall now, sir. Here is the point, sir—

Senator DANIEL. Let me ask you—

Mr. MATUSOW. I have an answer to that.

Senator DANIEL. Have you now recalled?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have a partial answer to you, sir. I was called to active duty in military service from the State of New Mexico and had a residence in that State. And throughout my time of active duty in the Air Force, in 1951, as well as my residence in 1950, according to State law, I was a resident of the State of New Mexico, and I established a residence again—reestablished residence in 1953, and according to—

Senator DANIEL. What year—what date in 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. I forget the date. It was in July.

Senator DANIEL. In July of 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you live prior to that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Washington, D. C.

Senator DANIEL. How long had you lived at Washington, D. C.?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, about a year, I guess.

Senator DANIEL. Then after having lived in Washington, D. C., for a year, you went back to New Mexico and established your residence?

Mr. MATUSOW. Residence again.

Senator DANIEL. In July of 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had about a year and a half residence and established residence again in 1953.

Senator DANIEL. You changed your residence in the meantime, though, to some other places; did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, as I said, sir, I did.

Senator DANIEL. Where did you live after New Mexico next to the last time that you lived in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. I lived in a lot of places, sir. I lived in Ohio, New York, in the District of Columbia.

Senator DANIEL. When did you leave New Mexico next to the last time, what year?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1953.

Senator DANIEL. Sir?

Mr. MATUSOW. When did I leave next to the last time? It was 1953.

Senator DANIEL. Before 1953, when did you leave?

Mr. MATUSOW. 1951.

Senator DANIEL. 1951. Where had you lived between 1951 and July 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. Lots of places.

Senator DANIEL. Name them.

Mr. MATUSOW. New York, Ohio, the District of Columbia.

Senator DANIEL. And you had not lived during that period of time in New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. So, therefore, your divorce action was filed in September 1953; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. And the allegations to which you swore here as having been a resident of the State of New Mexico for the preceding year then was not true; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. And I was later informed by my attorney that was not true. That is another reason the divorce action was dropped. I first thought through information, from one who was not too well informed on that, that my prior residence in the State covering a year and some odd months would be sufficient, on top of my newly established residence in the State of New Mexico.

Senator DANIEL. You read the instrument before swearing to it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir——

Senator DANIEL. Did you or did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not in too much detail; no, sir. I looked at it.

Senator DANIEL. Did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I trusted my attorney.

Senator DANIEL. Well, you swore to the instrument; did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator DANIEL. And you said there—

that plaintiff is now and for more than 1 year last past and next preceding the filing of this complaint has been a resident in good faith of the State of New Mexico and now resides in Santa Fe County of said State.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir—

Senator DANIEL. That was not true; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir. And in effect, my wife's residence in Nevada was not true, either—the fact they were going to—this is a divorce action, and I think you as an attorney know what some people do in divorce actions; go to Florida, the State of Idaho, maintain a residence for a few weeks

Senator DANIEL. I am not asking you about other people—just a moment.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. I am not asking you about other people. It is your truth and veracity—

Mr. MATUSOW. Right, sir.

Senator DANIEL. That is questioned here now, and the decision to be made is whether people were negligent in using your testimony in the past, before you turned on that testimony. It is up to us to determine whether or not you are lying now or were lying then, and these matters as to instances in which you have so easily lied and have so quickly double-crossed people are certainly relevant to this hearing.

Mr. MATUSOW. I understand that, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Yes; you understand why I have gone into this.

Mr. MATUSOW. I just appreciated the fact that I was able to state for the record that that action, being a divorce action, was a fairly commonplace thing in these United States today, because of the difference in divorce laws in different States.

Senator DANIEL. That, of course, is your opinion.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, just as you have judged so many other witnesses by yourself, it might be a mistake for you to judge other matters—that is, divorce in this country—by yourself.

Mr. Sourwine has been waiting here.

Senator WELKER. I want one question, Mr. Chairman.

Senator DANIEL. All right, Senator.

Senator WELKER. In the paragraph in his complaint for divorce he alleged that he had been for more than 1 year actually a bona fide resident of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator WELKER. That was sworn to under oath September of 1953. Yesterday afternoon you swore before this committee, you raised your hand to God and swore that in 1952 you voted in the State of New York. Will you tell us, How do you reconcile that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I just admitted, sir, that in this divorce proceeding I was playing it, shall we say, all the field, to get the residence. And I believed that I was doing no more and no less than many thousands of people have done in the State of Nevada, in the State of Idaho; this was my opinion and belief at the time.

Senator WELKER. Yes. In other words, when you lied to get a station wagon and a few other things and \$10 and attorney's fees—

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Senator WELKER. And—

Mr. MATUSOW. It was not quite that.

Senator WELKER. I make this observation to you, sir, that I think that you committed a lie before this committee yesterday or today, one or the two—I hate to say that to you.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I have been accused of being a liar by the press and by the committee, and it does not hurt that much, really—I admit it myself. I have been a liar many times. When the committee is trying to find out, I am trying to help. Thank you.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, can you give us a date since which you will now contend you have testified truly all of the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Can I give you a date where and when I testified truly?

Mr. SOURWINE. No. Can you give us a date and state that since that date you have testified truly and truthfully all of the time?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I testified truly and truthfully in Judge Dimock's court. That was in February of this year.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you go back of that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, my previous testimony before that goes to the question of other testimony before this committee, of their bodies, and statements, I believe not having read it, but on the basis—I believe on the basis of memory, some were not entirely true, some were true. Before this committee I told the truth and before Judge Dimock's court.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am trying to find out during what period we should consider that you now say you have been telling the truth and the whole truth.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe based on the present investigation of certain charges and allegations and statements I have made, trying to clear the air by my past testimony, I am telling the truth now, and I state again for the record that I am willing to undergo a lie detector or any other scientific means of determining if the committee determines so.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are still dodging the point. Cross-examination is still one of the best methods for detecting a lie.

Mr. MATUSOW. Agreed, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am trying to find out not a fact, but only what your claim is with respect to any date since which you claim to have been telling the truth.

(Witness conferred with counsel.)

Mr. SOURWINE. You have said that you had a religious experience.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I am consulting with counsel on that question. I do not quite—it isn't quite clear with me, and I want to—

Mr. SOURWINE. I am helping to clarify it. Let me add this, and then you may consult—

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So long as you want to. You have testified that you had a religious experience. It must have culminated at some time—if as you have testified you are now telling the truth—as a result of that religious experience—I am not asking you specifically

when that religious experience itself culminated, because I prefer to ask this question with respect to your state of mind rather than your emotions, but I am trying to find out if there is any period culminating now and extending back into the past during which you contend you have consistently told the truth.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

Mr. MATUSOW. In answer to your question, the specific day, as close to it as possible that I can remember about when I decided to, might say, level with you, from the top of the deck, play it straight, tell the truth, any term you want to use, but to tell the truth as I know I am doing now, was the day in October—the final break was—I mean it was building to this point, but the day that Corp. Claude Batchelor was sentenced to life imprisonment down in Kermit, Tex.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have not answered the question yet; I am sorry.

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry. Maybe I missed it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Perhaps you are so accustomed to splitting hairs that you will do it automatically, but you have only testified as to your state of mind; that is, when you decided to tell the truth, and what I am asking you about is a period of time during which you now swear you have been telling the truth.

Mr. MATUSOW. This present period is that period of time.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is what I wanted. You are now testifying then, that since the date in October when Batchelor was sentenced, you have consistently told the truth; is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. All appearances since then, which includes this appearance—the appearance in Judge Dimock's court and a few minutes before a grand jury in New York.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was October.

Mr. MATUSOW. 1954.

Mr. SOURWINE. 1954.

Mr. MATUSOW. That was the final date.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you told the truth since that time as a result of the religious experience that you have told us about?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have told the truth as a result of not only the religious experience, but all that goes with it, and it might not be construed as a religious experience.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes; but now, when you said you had told the truth, it sounded to me like you were qualifying it to cover only testimony given under oath. Did you intend that, or are you now saying that you have told the truth, both under oath and when not under oath since that date in October 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. Only leaving out certain things which would be in bad taste. That is, if a friend does not look good, I do not say, "You look miserable," that type of lie, but courtesy lie, you might call it.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, let me—

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I have told the truth, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I wanted to get that testimony clear on the record.

When you testified in Judge Dimock's court, did not you testify that you told the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, "When I testified I had been unstable and I should not have been a witness"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that is, to the best of my recollection this is what I testified to.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you mean to testify in Judge Dimock's court that you had told the House Un-American Activities Committee that you should not have been a witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe that I meant to say that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, in fact, tell the House Un-American Activities Committee that you should not have been a witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I had not read the testimony when I testified in Judge Dimock's court. I still do not know what I told the House Committee. You might not find it in there. I think I said, to the best of my recollection, and I opened myself up to a contradiction on that, because I was not too sure of it. So you might very well be right. The record will bear it out.

Mr. SOURWINE. The testimony now stands in this position. You have testified that you did tell Judge Dimock's court, while testifying under oath, that you had told the HUAC that you should not have been a witness—you have testified here that you intended to tell Judge Dimock's court that you had told the HUAC that you should not have been a witness.

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to see the quote.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have testified that you do not know whether you so testified before the HUAC. Do you want to leave the record in that condition?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not see where the contradiction lies, sir. You are making a big something out of nothing.

Mr. SOURWINE. I did not say contradiction. I say in that condition. I only asked if you want to leave the record in that condition.

Mr. MATUSOW. I think it explains itself; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you tell the House Un-American Activities Committee that you had been unstable in connection with your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I did, but I am not swearing to that now, because I have not read the testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, sir, did you not go back and read over this testimony very carefully in connection with the preparation of your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. That testimony you have there, read it very carefully.

Mr. SOURWINE. The testimony that you gave before the House Un-American Activities Committee on July 2, 1954—not this testimony, because you might mean by that merely this printed page, but did you not go back and read over the transcript or the printed copy of the transcript of your testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in July 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. I glanced at it, sir. I did not read it in detail.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not go back over it and read it carefully?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not every page; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying under oath that in preparing this book for publication you did not go back and carefully read the testimony that you had given before the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read parts of the testimony but not every page.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not go back and read it carefully?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not read every page. The pages I read I read carefully.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you select which pages to read?

Mr. MATUSOW. I took newspaper reports of the period dealing with a certain subject and I found that page.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you had to go over all of the pages to find those pages.

Mr. MATUSOW. You said read it carefully. I can skim over a page in a matter of seconds and get something I want.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anybody else indicate to you the pages of that testimony that you should read?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe at one point Mr. Kahn in our tape-recorded conversations, if my memory serves me correctly, said to me, "I just found an interesting inconsistency in your testimony before the House committee. You said you knew of no plot, et cetera, in relation to sabotaging industry, and yet before the Senate committee you said you did know of one."

Mr. Kahn pointed out that interesting point to me which I had neglected to catch, and I believe I used that in my book.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am glad to have that in the record, but it does not answer the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Kahn did in relation to the thing I just described.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are now testifying in response to my question as to whether anyone pointed out to you in the transcript of your testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee on July 12, 1954, what passages or what pages you should read from?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, I am sorry. I misunderstood. I thought you were talking about the February 6 and 7, 1952, testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. I do not think you misunderstood. I think you are deliberately confusing this record to have as much under oath as you are able to do, but we are going to get to the bottom of this, and I repeat the question: Did anyone indicate to you the pages of the record or the transcript of your testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, July 12, 1954, which you should read in connection with preparing the document which has become your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, was not your only use of the word "unstable" in your entire testimony on July 12, 1954, in connection with your trouble with your wife?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not believe so, sir. I believe you will find—in fact, Senator Eastland, the chairman, this morning while reading that testimony, came across the words "stability" and "instability" on a number of occasions, and put them in the record, as I recall now.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are splitting hairs again.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, you said is that the only mention, and I do not think it is.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not listen to the question, if you are not splitting hairs. I said, as a matter of fact, was not your only use of the word "unstable" in connection with your trouble with your wife.

Mr. MATUSOW. In that testimony?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not believe so, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this testimony which has been read from this morning be placed in small type in full in the record at this point. It is only a few pages.

Senator DANIEL. The document will be placed in the record.

(The document was marked "Exhibit No. 27" and appears below:)

EXHIBIT No. 27

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG YOUTH GROUPS (BASED OF TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW)—PART 2

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*Monday, July 12, 1954, Washington, D. C.*

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 11:25 a. m., in the Caucus Room of the Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer, Francis E. Walter, and Clyde Doyle.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Donald T. Appell, investigator; and Thomas H. Beale, clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will be in order.

Let the record show that present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, and myself as chairman, and there is a quorum of the full committee. Mr. Counsel, will you proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call as a witness Mr. Harvey M. Matusow.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HARVEY M. MATUSOW

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name, please.

Mr. MATUSOW. Harvey M. Matusow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Matusow, it is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You, I think, are familiar with the rules of the committee providing that you are entitled to have counsel with you, if you so desire.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Did the witness make it clear that he doesn't desire legal counsel?

Mr. MATUSOW. There is no necessity for counsel. I am here on my own.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are here subsequent to a subpoena that has been served on you, are you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. No member of the committee or the staff has, up to the present time, told you the reason for subpoenaing you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir, if I might go through the chronological order to get to that question, I left Dallas, Tex., at 10:35 last night, having worked all day and half the night before, and I arrived here at 6 o'clock this morning and arrived here at the House Office Building and, with the exception of a greeting of "Hello" and "How are you and how is your family?" I haven't had time to talk to any member of the staff.

Mr. CLARDY. Or any member of the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Who served you with your subpoena?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Donald T. Appell.

Mr. SCHERER. Where did he serve you?

Mr. MATUSOW. He served me here.

Mr. DOYLE. You got a telegram telling you there was a subpoena for you?

MR. MATUSOW. I received a call and I was told there was a subpoena, and my knowledge, limited as it is of the law, if I know that the individual who I am talking to is who he says he is, and I specifically asked him a few personal questions, Mr. Appell, that is, I know it was Mr. Appell, then I knew I was under subpoena whether I had it in my hand or otherwise.

MR. SCHERER. You knew if you did not respond you could have been subpoenaed?

MR. MATUSOW. I knew I could have been subpoenaed, but I knew, based on my knowledge of the subpoena laws of this country, that I was under subpoena before I arrived. The formality of giving me the paper did not put me under subpoena.

I was served last Friday on the telephone.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Matusow, you testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6 and 7 of 1952; did you not?

MR. MATUSOW. The full day of the 6th and I believe the morning of the 7th.

MR. TAVENNER. The committee desires to review, in a way, that testimony with you. You are familiar with it; are you not?

MR. MATUSOW. Very much so.

MR. TAVENNER. You have looked over your former testimony and studied it this morning; have you not?

MR. MATUSOW. No; I have not, sir. Once I gave the testimony it was given and it was fact, and fact does not lose anything in time.

MR. CLARDY. You have had a copy of the transcript this morning, or of the report?

MR. MATUSOW. No; I have not seen it.

MR. CLARDY. I thought you had.

MR. MATUSOW. There is no necessity for it, I don't think. Nothing I have said in that testimony or in the 25 or so times subsequent to that before various committees and court proceedings I have contradicted in any way the testimony I have given.

MR. TAVENNER. That is what the committee wants to inquire, as to whether or not any part of the testimony which you gave this committee is in error, or any statement in it which is false.

MR. MATUSOW. No. Might I, in answer to your question, very briefly trace a history of Harvey Matusow, shall we say, over the past 2 years and 4 months?

MR. VELDE. Yes; if it will be limited to the testimony and in answer to the question put to you by counsel.

MR. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; it will be in response. When I first testified before this committee in February 1952, I told the truth. In fact, I do not believe there is any editorial or any comment other than facts in that testimony the way it was prepared and given.

Since that time I have, with the exception of today, related all my testimony to the specific facts. But, in February 1952, I did not quite appreciate or realize the full scope of what the testimony would mean. I was a young veteran, just got out of the Air Force. In fact, I think I was still in the Air Force the first day I testified in executive session, and it did not quite penetrate. It was something new. My name was in the headlines and I did not appreciate all that was going on around me. It was happening too quick. In the past few months I have had time to reflect. The testimony is still there. Only now it has more stability to it which it did not have 2 years ago. There are no lies.

MR. SCHERER. When you say "stability," do you mean it has been confirmed since that time?

MR. MATUSOW. That is right, sir; and I have been able to reflect from my past now instead of living in it.

A few weeks ago I testified here in Washington before the Subversive Activities Control Board. I believe it was on the case of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and also on the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

I was asked in cross examination about a specific name, date, or place by the counsel for this Communist front, at which time my answer, which was not a premeditated answer which I since read in the record, to this Communist counsel who desired me putting the names of the so-called innocent persons in the record.

In other words, I was not putting the names in the record in the direct examination. I was not doing what the Communist Party claims the witness does before the committee, indiscriminantly dropping names, as they say.

Relating to the specific question, 2 years ago, I wouldn't have realized what was going on with this clever maneuvering, shall we say, of the counsel for the Communist front or the Communist press who claims that this is the role of the committee or of a witness.

That is in substance the answer.

Mr. VELDE. I think you understand that we Members of Congress, and especially the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, have a profound desire to see that the record is clear and to see that no false testimony comes before our group. We cannot vouch for witnesses. You say that the testimony is true, that as you gave it at the time and since you have had time to reflect on it, it has increased in stability.

Now, will you, for the benefit of the committee and for the benefit of the public tell how you prepared yourself to give this testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on February 6 and 7, 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. It started, I believe—I first met Mr. Appell during the world series in 1951. I was in the Air Force, stationed at Wright Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Appell was an investigator of the House Committee on Un-American Activities at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct. I believe it was October 5. My birthday is October 3, and it was in that period.

Prior to his coming out and before the committee contacted me, I had spent approximately 3 months in preparing an autobiography of sorts, a complete chronological list of events of my activities in the Communist Party and its front groups starting in 1946 when I joined the American Youth for Democracy, and going back further to my service in World War II in the Army where I was first contacted by Communists.

I prepared this chronological list of events of my activities and I believe it took about six drafts. I think the committee had received two of them.

I gave Mr. Appell the next to the last draft of this autobiography which I went over and over and over again to make sure that things were not in error.

Mr. VELDE. Did you prepare that from your memory alone, or did you also have notes and other documentary material?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had documentary material. Some of it was placed in the record of those days in February 1952 or placed in the record in the executive session which I believe was in November 1951. I had notes.

Mr. SCHERER. Was that the first time you testified before any congressional committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was the first time I testified anywhere, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. You have since testified about how many times?

Mr. MATUSOW. Specifically in February 1952 before the Senate Internal Security Committee, I believe the 20—something of that month.

March 7 and 8 of 1952 before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

March 11 or 13 before the Internal Security Committee of the Senate.

In March 1952 before the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.

Again in April 1952 before the Senate Internal Security Committee.

In October 1952, I believe, which was the 8th or 12th, in Salt Lake City before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

And again—oh, I skipped August 1952, before the United States attorney in New York as a witness in the trial of the second Smith indictment of the United States Government versus Elizabeth Gurley Flynn.

Mr. SCHERER. You testified before that grand jury, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; not before the grand jury then.

I testified in El Paso, Tex., in April of 1953 and then I testified before that trial in January 1954.

I testified before the Governor's commission set up by the Governor of Texas to investigate Communist infiltration of three trade unions in Texas. That was in December 1953.

I also testified in November 1953 before the Subversive Activities Control Board on a Labor Youth League case.

I testified in June 1954 before the Subversive Activities Control Board on both the cases of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Mr. SCHERER. On all those occasions you were under oath; were you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. In all that testimony did you state what was the truth to the best of your knowledge and belief?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I do not believe I told any untruths at any time under oath.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever tell anybody that you had lied or told an untruth at any time during your testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, that is not the case. An example of it might be a statement I gave to the New York Times.

Mr. CLARDY. That was not under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. I had it notarized.

Mr. CLARDY. But it was not a statement before the committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. In October 1952, I stated that there were X number of Communists on the New York Times. I do not want to state specifically how many now because I don't remember, as I said, what the correct figure is, to keep the record straight.

When I gave the statement in October, October 28, in Los Angeles, Calif., I read where this statement was purported to be a "retraction of my under oath testimony," but the statement was not that. The statement I gave them was that I did not personally know of the names of every member of the Communist Party, and when I gave a few speeches somewhere I referred to this though I stated the correct figure to the best of my knowledge based on facts and my experience in the Communist Party that because of, well, everything else I said, it might be and was construed and could have been construed to mean something else, but that was just merely saying in a speech somewhere that this was the case and not that, but the fact that there were X number of Communists and my knowledge based upon my Communist Party membership and experience, that I knew and I did not retract.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that had no relation to any testimony you gave before this committee.

Mr. MATUSOW. You said before any committee?

That related to the testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Committee, but it was a statement which I gave.

In relation to this committee, I have not given anybody any statements or said anything that would say I have lied under oath.

I have told somebody I found a stronger faith and belief in God which I had before but which is now more stable and that I have had a very warm and, shall we say, friendly, honest religious experience not in relation to any specific church.

Yes, that I said, but that I say here and that I will say again, but that doesn't distract or retract anything.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you have a copy of the affidavit you furnished the New York Times?

Mr. MATUSOW. That would necessitate a bit of work which would take a couple of weeks. In other words, all my files which are usually kept in good order, I have very purposely, for my own benefit, put somewhere and just let them sit and am putting things in there and some day I intend to sort them out.

Mr. SCHERER. You do have them in your possession?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not where I am now temporarily living. I do have it, but I could not get it conveniently without some extra work.

Mr. SCHERER. That would really explain this testimony with respect to the question of Communists in the United States?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; my statement only clarified in complete detail to the best of my knowledge what I said in 1 or 2 sentences under oath.

Mr. CLARDY. You did not change the essential facts in any way. You merely gave an explanation?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is so what I did say could not be construed to hurt innocent people, which I did not want to do and which nobody wants to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Matusow, do I understand that you are today, under oath, reaffirming the testimony that you gave this committee when you appeared before it on February 6 and 7, 1952?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reason the committee has asked these questions—

Mr. MATUSOW. If it is what I believe it is, sir, I have been searching for it myself.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Is that the committee received information that Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, at a public speech in Westminster, Md., on June 7, 1954, as related in the Evening Star edition of that date, had this to say:

Harvey Matusow, whom he described as a former investigator for Senator McCarthy, sought him—

meaning Bishop Oxnam—

out twice, the bishop said, to say he had had a religious experience and wished someone to undo "all the lies I have told about many people."

"In an hour such as this," Bishop Oxnam said, "what we need is the unbiased approach and the undaunted spirit to return to 'whatsoever things are true.'"

MR. MATUSOW. Pardon me, I am listening to you, but I would like to have something here in my briefcase that will relate to it.

MR. TAVENNER. And the committee is also in receipt of information that Bishop Oxnam spoke at the First Methodist Church in Evanston, Ill., on some date in June of 1954.

MR. MATUSOW. May I see that statement in the paper?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes; in just a moment.

And it is reported to the committee that in the course of that speech he referred again to you in substance as follows: That Harvey Matusow came to him at some meeting in New York at a time when he was very busy and wanted to speak to him.

It was in between sessions of something, and he said he told Matusow he did not have time to give him an audience, but Matusow said he wanted to have just a minute with him anyway.

The sum and substance of it was that Matusow had told him how he had lied and lied for the committee and how deeply he felt about it all because, as Oxnam put it, he had had a religious experience.

That, you see, is a serious matter and it was important for the committee to recall you to make certain that your testimony was not in error before this committee in any respect.

MR. MATUSOW. The first point before I get to either of them, my testimony was not in error. I refer again to the stability and instability which I hope I was able to clarify.

MR. CLARDY. By that you mean that you were telling the truth when you were before this and other committees?

MR. MATUSOW. Yes; that was given now as a complete, what I believe constructive approach and the truth told by the instability—not the fault of the committee—but I at the time, a young veteran just getting out of the service for the second time and trying to find my way around, still telling the truth, and it might not have related and it might have had a destructive effect on what the committee was trying to do.

The constructive and destructive aspects do not mean that the committee wants to have anything destructive, but my ignorance might have been destructive.

MR. CLARDY. Have you at any time told Bishop Oxnam that you have lied to this committee or any other committee when you were under oath?

MR. MATUSOW. Before I answer that, which I will do clearly and freely and without any qualifications—and you might call this a qualification—I just glanced at the newspaper story. I had heard about it and I did not know that had anything to do with the reason for my being here, but before I say that Bishop Oxnam did what he said I did, I would like to find out if the newspaper did as many Washington newspapers do. I have seen them do, and I have a copy relating to me on some other subject just recently, that is, report facts with much fiction and coloring of the reporter who reads into what he hears what he wants to read into it, or the editor or somebody, but I will presume that either the newspaper or the bishop, one or the other who has said really where I did meet Bishop Oxnam twice—I met him not at a meeting but at a radio broadcast, not knowing he would be there, and I introduced myself and I talked with Bishop Oxnam and his wife for a few minutes.

I do not hate any man. We all move in shades of gray. I was a Communist. I am not one now.

You cannot hate a man who has the way of God.

I said, "This is a marvelous experience I have had" in relation to the stability and instability I referred to, and I did not say and I do not say now that I ever lied under oath. If I had lied under oath, I have no qualms about saying so.

MR. CLARDY. I want to call attention to the fact that the article itself is rather vague in the way that it worded. There is an implication that the bishop believes, rather than a direct statement. He did not mention this committee, but since this is the only committee that he appeared before, it is the natural assumption that he was referring to us.

I was not here when you testified before, and I am intensely interested in it.

Mr. MATUSOW. I would give the bishop the benefit of the doubt as to who said it. I believe the newspapermen like to color what he did say and put the word "lie" in, more likely than he.

Mr. CLARDY. You haven't heard the bishop very often.

Mr. MATUSOW. I say this without hate toward any man, I am not going to say that he is the one who said I lied.

Mr. SCHERER. If the bishop was correctly reported by the newspapers, did he tell the truth?

Mr. MATUSOW. If he was correctly reported by the newspapers, the bishop is a dishonest man.

Mr. DOYLE. Have you read his book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Parts of it, sir. Parts of it I agree with and many parts I disagree with.

Mr. CLARDY. You heard the title of the book.

Mr. MATUSOW. I protest. I have seen it. I have read parts of it.

I am not an absolutist. I cannot form absolute opinions about people and their works. It is just inconceivable for me to do so because I have traveled life too much.

Mr. VELDE. We did not ask him any opinion about the book. That is not within our province.

Mr. DOYLE. Is the House Un-American Activities Committee named in this article to which we are referring?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not in the newspaper article.

Mr. DOYLE. It was not specified?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. You have enumerated some 7 or 8 boards or committees before which you have testified since February 1952. Before any of those boards or committees were you paid a professional fee for so testifying?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, yes; let me say 1, 2, 3, maybe 4, maybe 5 occasions, and that was the Subversive Activities Control Board, they gave me a fee of \$25 a day and once before an Immigration Service had me in New York and I don't remember the individual, but they paid me a fee of \$25. On a number of occasions when I received that fee I turned it over to a charity of some sort.

Mr. WALTER. That is the usual fee provided for by law.

Mr. MATUSOW. As the per diem?

Mr. WALTER. That is provided for by law.

Mr. MATUSOW. I thought that was something I was not entitled to.

Mr. CLARDY. Nine dollars is what some lucky Government employees get for their board and room.

Mr. WALTER. No significance can be attached to the fact that you are paid the same fee as is paid every other expert witness?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was not familiar with the fact that I was getting something I was entitled to.

Mr. WALTER. The impression was being created that you were being treated differently.

Mr. DOYLE. The purport of my question did not go to that line at all. I wanted to show whatever the facts and terms were under which this gentleman testified. If he received an expert fee, that classifies him as an expert in the minds of whoever paid him the fee, at least.

Mr. CLARDY. You did not get anything from this committee other than the usual \$6?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall a \$6 figure.

Mr. CLARDY. At any time in your conversation with Bishop Oxnam did the name "Un-American Activities" creep into the conversation?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; as did it before the other boards.

Mr. CLARDY. In connection with that matter specifically referring to this committee, did you make any statement that would enable the bishop to go forth and honestly say that you had lied to us?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; but it might enable him to go forth and—no; he couldn't say I lied because—well, come to think of it, I might have given him a wrong address on the first occasion because I believe my father was beaten up about 2 weeks before I testified in 1952, or on a number of occasions I have given a wrong address specifically—

Mr. SCHERER. For the reasons you have stated.

Mr. MATUSOW. For the security of my family, mainly.

Mr. CLARDY. You were said to have made the statement that you were an investigator for Senator McCarthy. Were you on any committee payroll?

Mr. MATUSOW. A popular misconception because of the domestic dispute I had when I was a bit more on the unstable side.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you tell the bishop you had been an investigator for that committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not believe I said "investigator." I might have said that I had campaigned for, and I think he knew that, Senator McCarthy in 1952. I might have said that I did some work on a semivolunteer basis in relation to the State Department Overseas Library and I might have said—and I believe I did, without any reflection upon the work of the committees here—that I do not completely agree at all times with the work of this committee and Senator McCarthy's committee. I use the word "tactics" and some people say method because to me tactics is a public—communism wants to destroy God and the love of man. I am against communism and if I feel on a specific occasion some Member of Congress—as a private citizen—if I feel he used the wrong tactic in order to achieve being for this country and in that way be against communism, then I will state so privately and publicly, but with that in mind, tactic is my term.

Mr. CLARDY. In the prior testimony, and I believe I was not present then, you identified a considerable number of persons as members of the party.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe the figure is one-hundred-and-eighty-some odd.

Mr. CLARDY. I haven't counted it up, but I know it is a considerable number.

Mr. MATUSOW. It is.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you make a false identification of a single one of those persons?

Mr. MATUSOW. I went over that list with a fine-tooth comb, shall we say, and in fact, as I recall, there were some names that were in doubt in relation to the criteria I set up for identification at the time.

I set up, and Mr. Appell can bear this out because we discussed it, the basis of identification was based on rules of evidence even though I was not before a court and was not bound by the court rules of evidence.

Mr. CLARDY. I wanted to make sure that there was no such error.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you testified before this committee, were you not advised and requested to omit any name in which there was any possible doubt in your mind?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I meant sir. We did do that. We based it on rules of evidence. I had many weeks of discussion with an attorney and his wife, who are friends of mine, on what was rules of evidence in relation to testimony that was forthcoming at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Clardy?

Mr. CLARDY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer, do you have any other questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle, do you have any other questions?

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. CLARDY. I have complete confidence in the accuracy of the reporting of the speeches that are under discussion.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Matnsw, I thank you for coming to the committee again. We regret very much that we are obliged to belabor you and take you away from your business which I understand you are now engaged in in Dallas, Tex.

If there is nothing false about any of the testimony you have given before this committee, and that is what we are interested in, and if in the future you should find some place where you had made a mistake, we would ask you to come and clear it up with us so that we might, as nearly as possible, keep our records straight and have only true facts and information with which to work. Again I want to thank you.

You are dismissed.

Mr. MATUSOW. May I just ask the committee something? I have traveled around this country, not in relation to the case of this testimony, but to the people all over this country who don't know about why the Communists go after young people.

There have been a number of people who did come before this committee and have testified in some detail and some sketches on communism and youth.

Every time that testimony appears—and I believe mine was the first specifically on that subject, just a humble opinion or suggestion if I may, maybe because it was my testimony and not in relation to the case, but the tactics of the Communists, I think the committee is missing a bet of doing a great service to this country, which you have done at times that I have known about, but in

relation to 100 Things You Should Know About Communism, which was published and which is widely known and used, I think the committee might save a lot of young people from going down the road of communism, thinking, as some of the Korean prisoners did, that nobody was there to indoctrinate them as to how communism works.

It has been lacking and it is needed and people need it.

Mr. VELDE. I can assure you we are doing our best to keep the public informed.

Mr. MATUSOW. But, sir, they are tomorrow's adults. We have already made up our minds and they haven't.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is dismissed and the committee stands adjourned until Wednesday morning at 10:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the hearing was adjourned to Wednesday, July 14, 1954, at 10:30 a. m.)

Mr. SOURWINE. I do not want to haggle with this witness, so I will pass on. I would like to make this statement. If I may use it, Mr. Chairman, I will give it to the reporter.

Senator DANIEL. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. I will make this statement that an examination of this record will show that the word "unstable" is used only once, and then in connection with your trouble with your wife; that subsequently you used the words "stability" and "instability" as Senator Eastland read them this morning.

Mr. MATUSOW. Touché.

Mr. SOURWINE. I submit that there is nothing, Mr. Chairman, in this testimony which could possibly have given anyone the idea that the witness was testifying that he had been unworthy to have been a witness at the time of his prior testimony.

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Sourwine, was the testimony given that he had so informed this committee? Was that given under oath in Judge Dimock's court?

Mr. SOURWINE. He did not testify before this committee, sir. You mean before the House Un-American Activities Committee? In Judge Dimock's court at page 246 of the typed transcript it will be found that Mr. Matusow told Judge Dimock's court that he had told the Un-American Activities Committee of the House:

When I testified, I had been unstable. I should not have been a witness.

I am not attempting to testify. I asked the witness questions about it, and he has himself testified on that point here.

Senator DANIEL. I understand.

Mr. SOURWINE. We will pass to another question.

I want to point out to you that your testimony in court was after the date on which you claimed you started being truthful and accurate. I want now to ask you if you were honest with your present publisher when you went to them to sell your book.

Mr. MATUSOW. The statement has many broad connotations. I was honest with them only to the point as I have testified to here, and in Judge Dimock's court that at first I did not trust Mr. Kahn or Mr. Cameron.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you sat down to have luncheon with them at the hotel on that first day that you had gotten to New York after they had sent you an airline ticket, did you not present to them written material which was not wholly your own and which you represented to them to be your own work and your own product wholly?

Mr. MATUSOW. Some material to be my own work and my own product, and some material partly mine and partly my product. And the material was represented to them as such.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are stating now that you did tell them that this was not your own material?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not say that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Clarify the record on that, will you?

Mr. MATUSOW. On part of the material which I gave them I said, "This is wholly mine, unedited." This other portion—

Mr. SOURWINE. What was it that you said, "This was wholly mine, unedited"?

Mr. MATUSOW. I had 65 or 70 pages of draft material on the book already written.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you talking about the McCarthy chapter, so-called?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. SOURWINE. What are you talking about?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am talking about some notes I had made on the book in the first-draft form, 65 or 70 pages of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you told them, "This is wholly my own work"?

Mr. MATUSOW. And it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. Go ahead. What else did you give them?

Mr. MATUSOW. Then I gave them an outline of the book which was wholly my work, and then I gave them the chapter on the McCarthy campaign, every sentence of which was mine, but which had been edited for me in a technical sense, technical editing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you—

Mr. MATUSOW. And I represented it to them as such.

Mr. SOURWINE. You told them it had been edited?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you tell them who edited it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Jack Anderson.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is that the same Jack Anderson who worked for Mr. Drew Pearson?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you not testified here that that chapter of McCarthy was wholly your own work?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I said every sentence in the book and on that chapter was mine, and I state that again, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was not that chapter rewritten by Mr. Anderson as you have just indicated?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have indicated that the sentences were mine, and the editing was his.

Mr. SOURWINE. My question was, Was not that chapter rewritten?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; not to my knowledge, and I had a good knowledge of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, did you ever testify anywhere about what was in any of Owen Lattimore's books?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection was that I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever read any of Owen Lattimore's books?

Mr. MATUSOW. Don't recall if I did or did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where do you remember that you testified about what was in any of his books?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I testified before this committee in the month of February, in the month of March, both 1952, about Mr. Owen Lattimore's books.

Mr. SOURWINE. I said about what was in his books.

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is before this committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have so indicated in your book, have you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. With regard to Mr. Lattimore, did you testify about overt acts or about ideas to cause impressions, attitudes, and beliefs?

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to read that testimony and then I will answer your question, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you stating that you do not now remember?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall nothing more about the testimony other than that I was called to appear before the Lattimore—before the committee on the Lattimore case. I will gladly answer your questions after having read the testimony, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think, sir, that your testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had anything to do with the indictment of Owen Lattimore for perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. No; not in relation to the indictment, but in relation to prejudicing the American people, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You think the American people had anything to do with the indictment of Owen Lattimore for perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. It is a long story behind that indictment of Owen Lattimore.

Mr. SOURWINE. You can answer my question "Yes" or "No," Mr. Matusow. Do you think the American people had anything to do with the indictment of Owen Lattimore for perjury?

Mr. MATUSOW. Public opinion, yes, sir. Public opinion had to be created.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you think your testimony with regard to Mr. Lattimore had anything to do with creating that public opinion?

Mr. MATUSOW. Undoubtedly, sir. The newspapers picked it up and gave it screaming headlines.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you read the IPR hearings?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have looked at some of them; yes, sir. There are 15 or 16 volumes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you read your own testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am included, I think, in 2 volumes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you read your own testimony about Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not recently, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When?

Mr. MATUSOW. After it was published.

Mr. SOURWINE. Naturally, but at what time with relation to the present date?

Mr. MATUSOW. Oh, within the last 2 years.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, as a matter of fact, did not you read it over carefully in connection with the final check on the accuracy of what was in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I glanced at it. I did not read it carefully and minutely.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you trying to have us believe, sir, that this book which you have sworn under oath contains nothing but the truth was checked against testimony which was mentioned in the book by a mere casual glance at that testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not quote the testimony—I do not recall—I might have, but I took the word of the New York Times. I checked newspaper stories of my testimony, and the New York Times is a reputable newspaper that reports objectively, and, therefore, I felt that I did not have to plow through pages and pages of testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you know whether your testimony about Mr. Lattimore was cited before the grand jury?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have not the slightest idea what Mr. Cohn gave to the grand jury.

Mr. SOURWINE. That still does not answer the question. Matters have gotten before the grand jury through someone else besides Mr. Cohn.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was under the impression that he presented the whole case.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether your testimony was cited before the grand jury?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. You seem to have the greatest difficulty in answering a simple question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. You finally did, simple direct questions.

Does your book contain the statement, "I climaxed my testimony with the dramatic assertion that Owen Lattimore's books were used as the official Communist Party guide on Asia?"

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; in substance I said that. I said that in the book. In substance I said it before the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is your interpretation of what you said before the committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, now, as a matter of fact, you did not testify before the committee, did you, that Lattimore's book was the official Communist Party guide on Asia?

Mr. MATUSOW. I recall having done so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you not testify only that Mr. Lattimore's book was sold in Communist Party book stores, that it was pushed by Communist Party bookstores, that it was advertised by Communist Party bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. And I also recall—maybe I am wrong—

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you let me finish my question?

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). That it was advertised by Communist Party bookstores and that you had been told by someone in authority in the educational department of the Communist Party that the book contained supplemental Communist Party material?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I said; that is what I said. What I say in the book in substance, just what you told me, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your opinion is that what I stated in my question, asking you if you had so testified, is the same as testifying that Owen Lattimore's books were used as the official party guide on Asia?

Mr. MATUSOW. There is no difference in substance, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is fine. Let me ask you about the components. As a matter of fact, Owen Lattimore's books to your knowledge were sold in Communist Party bookstores; were they not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I sold them; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. To your knowledge, Owen Lattimore's books were pushed by Communist Party bookstores and advertised by them; were they not?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you testifying that they were not advertised?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall any advertisements of his books.

Mr. SOURWINE. For your information, I will state that a reproduction of one of those advertisements is in our IPR record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Fine. Then you refresh my recollection. I do not deny it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you now know that it is true that Owen Lattimore's books were advertised by Communist Party bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. You told me so, and if you tell me so, I will take your word for it.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am asking you whether you know of your own knowledge.

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. Not at this time do I know of my own knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, we come down to the single question, whether Owen Lattimore's books were represented to you as containing the Communist Party line. I will ask you if you have not testified that books which are contrary to the Communist Party line may not be sold and are not sold in Communist bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. I testified to that effect: yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that true testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. That books not of the Communist line and contrary to the Communist line—partially true, partially false.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are books which are contrary to the Communist Party line sold in Communist bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. Depending upon what part of the Communist Party line you are talking about, sir. A very broad thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. What books which are contrary to the Communist Party line are sold in Communist bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, talking about books and periodicals which are all sold there.

Mr. SOURWINE. I said books, Mr. Matusow—you do not have to broaden it—we are talking about books.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will think of one. In specific, I seem to recall a book on—oh, let's see, I will give you the title in a minute—a number of children's books did not carry any Communist Party line that were sold in the bookshop.

Mr. SOURWINE. Exclusive of children's books, Mr. Matusow, do you know of any books which were contrary to the Communist Party line which were sold in the Communist bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; a book published by—well, it was published in England, and then here by Gare Associates. Catholic Freedom or Catholic Politics, Vatican and World Politics, by Averill Manhattan; by Beacon called Catholic Freedom and American Power, by Paul Blanchard, which was contrary to the Communist Party line and, in

fact, red-baited, according to the Communist Party, and was sold quite extensively through the bookshops. Two examples. For other examples, if you want to know what books, I want to give you a list of them, I can give you quite an extensive list.

Mr. SOURWINE. Please do, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. Very good—very well, sir. I seem to recall some controversy over a book by Dr. Margaret Mead which, according to the Communist Party discussions I had were chauvinistic. That book was nevertheless carried in the Communist Party bookshops.

One of the books was taken off of the shelf, but others were not, by Anna Louise Strong, after she was expelled from Russia and were sold and distributed and encouraged by it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you saying that Anna Louise Strong wrote a book contrary to the Communist Party line?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, one of her books, as I stated previously in testimony, vanished immediately from the Communist Party bookshelves.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was not because of what was in the book; was it?

Mr. MATUSOW. It was because of what was in Mrs. Strong, apparently.

Mr. SOURWINE. I beg your pardon?

Mr. MATUSOW. Apparently it was what was in Mrs. Strong, not in the book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes; of course.

Mr. MATUSOW. But this is a broad category. I will take back Mrs. Strong. We will get to a few authors.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have not you testified—

Mr. MATUSOW. The book by Averill, published by Gare Associates.

Mr. SOURWINE. On the Gare book, have you not testified with regard to one book that it was kept off the shelves of the Communist Party bookstores, although it followed the Communist line, because there was in it the single statement that the writer was against communism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have testified to that, but I do not think it was true, because those two books I just mentioned were sold in Communist Party bookshops that I worked in—the bookshops, plural.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, is it not—

Senator DANIEL. Mr. Matusow, could you give a "Yes" or "No" answer to some of these questions that call for a "Yes" or "No" answer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I can, and if counsel would ask me—

Senator DANIEL. You know in your book you state that failure to give a "Yes" or "No" answer is the witness' means of taking the fifth amendment.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said the friendly witness on the fifth amendment is evasive by saying, "I must explain," or "Let me explain."

Senator DANIEL. Will you answer this last question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. MATUSOW. If the counsel would please repeat the question I will be glad to.

Mr. SOURWINE. Read the question.

(The record was read by the reporter.)

Senator DANIEL. Have you so testified or not?

Mr. MATUSOW. The question is, I might have, and I presume at this point my recollection is that I did testify that a book was kept off the bookshelves because of the single paragraph or phrase that was anti-Communist. I seem to recall testifying to that effect.

Senator DANIEL. Your answer is "Yes," that you did so testify, is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I did, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, do you not know that no book is sold in the Communist Party bookstore without the approval of the educational commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I do not know that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not know that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I want to be sure that you have ample time to complete your list of all of the books which to your knowledge were non-Communist books, were anti-Communist books, which were sold in Communist Party bookstores.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, let's put it this way, sir: Point 1, in relation to an answer, on many books I am not going to give you an opinion—I do not think it would be right for the committee to say—for me to say, "This is a Communist book," and it isn't because that would be my saying that so and so is a Communist writer, and I am not going to do that, and I cannot do that, because I am in no position to do that. I am not going to set myself up as an arbitrator as to what is and what is not a Communist book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, I am not asking you to set yourself up as an arbitrator. I just want this record to read truly. You indicated for the record that I was stopping you before you were through with your list of examples. I want the record to show that you have every opportunity to complete the naming of any and all examples of books in that category that you want to name.

Mr. MATUSOW. I will do it very quickly then, sir.

A complete selection of Modern Library books, that is, plays, books on theater, books on art, poetry and what not, completely nonpolitical books, and many of them written by people who have, according to the Communist Party, been very anti-Communist in their actions and deeds and therefore if Communist Party books, only Communist and pro-Communist books were there, these would not normally have been in the bookshops, but this was not the case, and books were found in the bookshop and sold and distributed and purchased.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have just resorted to a device that you used not too frequently to be effective, that is, giving an answer not in your usual precise manner, but in a rambling form that comes out gobbledegook in the record. I want this record to be clear. I want you to answer "Yes" or "No." Have you now named all of the books that you care to name as examples of anti-Communist books which were sold in Communist Party bookstores?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not all that I care to name, but all that I can recall at this time.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read one paragraph from our hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, from page 3820.

Senator DANIEL. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE (reading) :

Mr. MATUSOW. I would like to point out an example of the book which does not deal with the subject of China, of an example of somebody who wrote a book that was not a Communist, and the book carried the party line. There was a book called, I believe American Freedom and Catholic Power by Paul Blanchard, which was published while I was still at the bookshop. That book adhered to the Communist line in relation to the Catholic Church. It was a good text, so far as it went. They would not recommend the book because in the book Mr. Blanchard stated he was opposed to communism. Though he carried the party line through in his book, it was not considered recommended reading for Communists.

Senator FERGUSON. Because of that one sentence or that one line, and not meaning the party line, but the fact that he had mentioned that he personally was opposed to communism they felt that there was enough deviation from the line that they would not sell that book in their bookshop?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Did you hear that, Mr. Matusow?

Mr. MATUSOW. I so testified, and then falsely.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was false testimony!

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. In what respect was it false?

Mr. MATUSOW. The book was sold and distributed and pushed quite widely in the Communist bookshops.

Mr. SOURWINE. To your knowledge?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, have you stated that you accused Owen Lattimore of being a Red, although you did not know who he was?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have accused him of being a Communist and Communist front on many occasions in speeches; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. My question was whether you had stated that you had accused him of being a Red although you did not know who he was.

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know if I said, though, I didn't know who he was or if I said I didn't know him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Lattimore was a writer?

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me?

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know he was a writer?

Mr. MATUSOW. I found out he was when I read his book, *Ordeal by Slander*.

Mr. SOURWINE. You now recall that you read that book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I read that book after I testified.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know he had written a book called *Solution in Asia*?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I was familiar with the fact that he had written a book.

Mr. SOURWINE. At the time you testified?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir, I knew he had written a book—knew he had written *Solution in Asia*, now I think of it, *Situation in Asia*.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you seen those books?

Mr. MATUSOW. Seen the dust jackets of them. I might have thumbed through them, but I didn't read them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where had you seen them?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I might have had one in my library. I saw them here at the committee office and in the bookshops where I worked.

Mr. SOURWINE. Communist bookshops?

Mr. MATUSOW. Communist bookshops, and a pro-Communist, if you call it that, bookshop.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you ever at that time met Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you ever discussed him or his books with any Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you, Mr. Matusow, in speaking for Movietone News say:

In false testimony I accused Owen Lattimore of writing books that carried the official Communist Party line while actually I had no knowledge of that.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you in fact accuse Owen Lattimore of writing books that carried the official Communist Party line?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know, Mr. Matusow, that advance copies of Mr. Lattimore's book, *Solution in Asia*, were sent to Mr. Gromyko, Mr. Kisseelev, Mr. Litvinoff, Mr. Varga, and Mr. Voitinsky, and other members or officials, Soviet officials?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stated that you read the I. P. R. hearings before this committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I read some of the material in them.

Mr. SOURWINE. You will find on page 3313 the citation of the sending of those advance copies of Mr. Lattimore's book, *Solution in Asia*, to those officials of the Soviet Union, and you said that you never read that testimony?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall having read it.

Mr. SOURWINE. You told us there were three Communist bookstores in New York City; was that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. Three bookstores that carried Communist Party literature; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You stated before us that these bookstores sold only publications that were either published or recommended by the Communist Party, that they sold nothing that was not Communist or pro-Communist; is that correct?

Mr. MATUSOW. I probably said so. Not having reread it, I take your word for it, that being the substance, that it is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you now state that that was a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. I say that in substance it was not entirely true, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you have stated here unequivocally that certain facts were true which, if true, render this quoted statement untrue.

Mr. MATUSOW. The bookshops sold Communist literature recommended by the Communist Party and certain books which were not recommended by the Communist Party, as I have stated.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you stating that there were some books which were recommended by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Marx' *Das Kapital* was recommended by the Communist Party. That is a good example.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have a list of books which were recommended by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall any, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. How do you know that Das Kapital was recommended by the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, maybe I did not know. In fact, I did not even know they recommended the Communist Manifesto, because I never was naive enough to ask, "Are we reading Das Kapital this week?"

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, we know you are not naive. I am not attempting to tell you what the facts are. I am only attempting to find out what you are now saying. Within 30 seconds you have testified that they were and that they were not. I am trying to get the facts on the record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Look, sir. I, as a Communist, knew that I did not have to be told that the Communist Manifesto was a book I had to read or Das Kapital was a book that the Communist Party endorsed. Marx classics were endorsed by the Communist Party. I did not doubt this. And I did not ask people whether they were or were not. This was an accepted fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. We were talking about books having been recommended as reading by the Communist Party. You testified, sir, before us, "We had instructions in the bookshop that came down from the New York State Educational Department of the Communist Party to refer the members of the party to the following books," and then you named some books.

I am attempting to find out if in truth you had any instructions to refer members of the party to any certain lists of books—did you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir, not in that sense.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, in that sense then you are now testifying there were no recommended books, is that right?

Mr. MATUSOW. In that sense, sir, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. You mean in that sense you are testifying that there were no recommended books?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. In your testimony before us you referred to the Liberty Book Club—the Communist Party book club. Was that a lie?

Mr. FAULKNER. Would Mr. Sourwine identify what he is referring to when he says, "You testified"? Is he referring to testimony before this committee during the past couple of weeks or is he referring to testimony that took place some time ago?

Mr. SOURWINE. I should like to submit to the Chairman, in the first place, that counsel has no right to interject at this point. If the question is unclear to the witness, he can say so.

And in the second place, that since my question only asked if a certain statement was a lie, it is immaterial for the purposes of answering that question when it was made.

Senator DANIEL. Repeat the question, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. I said, Mr. Matusow, you testified before us and referred to the Liberty Book Club as the Communist Party book club. Was that a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. When did I testify to that, sir?

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is, was that a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall the testimony. Would you refresh my recollection as to where and when I testified to that?

Senator WELKER. Maybe counsel could help him—tell him when it was.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you, Mr. Matusow, contending that you did not so testify?

Mr. MATUSOW. I am contending I haven't got a recollection. I would like to be refreshed as to where and when I made that testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. We will locate it in the hearing record.

Mr. MATUSOW. Was it in the IPR hearings? That would be sufficient.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is in the IPR hearings.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. Volume 11, I presume.

Mr. SOURWINE. Maybe you can tell me the page, Mr. Matusow.

Mr. MATUSOW. I could probably locate it quicker than Mr. Mandel.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am quite sure that you are thoroughly familiar with those hearings.

Mr. MATUSOW. Not with all of it, sir, but certain aspects of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, my question still stands, was that testimony a lie?

Mr. MATUSOW. I did not know the Liberty Book Club was a Communist Party club, so it was not a true statement. You are correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you now know that the Liberty Book Club was the Communist Party book club?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you appeared before us, Mr. Matusow, to testify on youth organizations you produced over 20 exhibits, physical exhibits.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe quite a few.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you now say that these were spurious or were they genuine?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, kind of a half and half—maybe not half and half.

(Senator Eastland entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SOURWINE. Then you produced before us a document which was a spurious or forged document—do you want us to understand that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, I believe that I can think of two specific documents I produced to this committee which were documents I obtained not through my own knowledge, but through the office of Counterattack, the publication that I later went to work for, and not only that, sir, also as a witness before that committee, and documentation produced for your committee in that hearing, was a witness named Herbert Romerstein, who produced many documents which he had no knowledge of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Confine yourself to your testimony, if you please.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir. The two leaflets I produced for the committee and which are reproduced in that book dealing with the Boy Scouts, with something about "Workers, Children of the World, Unite, you have nothing to lose, the Boy Scouts," or some such statement. That document was a document which was used as an advertisement or promotional material for the publication Counterattack, and to my knowledge had no bearing on reality, although the docu-

ment might have been a true document—I have no personal knowledge of it, and accepted it from the publication Counterattack and gave it to the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you stating now that that was a fraudulent or false document?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know if it was true or not true. Only that I received it from Counterattack, the publication, and gave it to the committee.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you were testifying before us, sir, in that Institute of Pacific Relations hearing, do you remember being questioned by Senator Ferguson?

Mr. MATUSOW. Do I recall——

Mr. SOURWINE. Excuse me.

Mr. MATUSOW. By Senator Ferguson?

Mr. SOURWINE. By Senator Ferguson.

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, if you read the questions, maybe it will come back to me. Was that the afternoon session?

Mr. SOURWINE (reading):

Senator FERGUSON. You appreciate that you are under oath here?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. And that what you are saying here about certain people is under oath.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct, sir.

Senator FERGUSON. And that what you say about their work is under oath?

Mr. MATUSOW. That is correct.

Senator FERGUSON. And you want to leave the record stand now just as it is?

Mr. MATUSOW. Right again, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. No further questions.

Senator EASTLAND. Thank you, sir. We will recess.

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Morris; on the youth?

(Senator Daniel left the hearing room.)

Mr. SOURWINE. I said the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. MATUSOW. Pardon me. I thought you were talking about youth. I just could not get that straight. Because we jump from one to another.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember the testimony I have just read?

Mr. MATUSOW. Just vaguely, I presume—I accept that as correct testimony, that the testimony is there. And I recall the statements; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you state now that you sat there knowing that you had testified falsely and replied to Senator Ferguson's questions as I have just read from the record?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I sat there knowing that what he was saying, said what I said, knowing I was telling a few untruths.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, you have stated variously that you are an expert on communism and that you are under oath, there is some question how many hundreds or thousands of books on Marxism or communism you have read or parts of which you have read. I would like to ask you for your opinion, if you have any opinion at all on the subject, and without regard to what degree of expert you may be, is the statement true that a Communist is a conspirator?

Mr. MATUSOW. Some are, some are not in my opinion.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you when you were a member of the Communist Party, United States of America, a conspirator?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know. I was a Communist. To what extent I was a conspirator, I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by the word "conspirator" as you have answered those questions?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, the thing is, I do not know what you mean by it. That is why I am being a little ambiguous in the answer.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not ask for any definition of the word—you answered the question and I am giving you a chance now for the record to state what your understanding of the word was when you answered the question.

Mr. MATUSOW. To me, sir, a conspirator is one who is going to go out and through the use of devious means, through dishonesty, through violence, if you will, and force, destroy the workings of this Nation and that is conspiracy in relation to this country. I, as a Communist, did not undertake that, the attitude of violently destroying, disturbing, or overthrowing our Constitution, or form of Government. And the members of the Communist Party who I knew, were in my club, did not, to my knowledge, take the position of advocating the advocacy of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now I see why you answered the question the way you did.

Let me define "conspiracy" as I intend to use the word.

Mr. MATUSOW. Thank you.

Mr. SOURWINE. As meaning the action by several persons in concert toward the attainment of a common objective. Do you understand that?

Mr. MATUSOW. Like a baseball team, wanting to win a pennant?

Mr. SOURWINE. We will not confine it, if you please, to baseball teams.

Mr. MATUSOW. Or football or something. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Using the word "conspiracy" as meaning the action of two or more persons in concert for the attainment of a common objective, I will ask you, Were you, as a Communist, a conspirator?

Mr. MATUSOW. As a human being I am a conspirator, with that definition, sir. It is too broad.

The committee is a conspirator. You want to attain a common goal, the upholding of the Constitution. The people are common conspirators when they belong to any organization.

Senator EASTLAND. A conspiracy to uphold the Constitution.

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know—according to Mr. Sourwine's definition everything is a conspiracy. If two people get together for a game of bridge, they are conspirators.

Senator EASTLAND. Proceed.

Mr. SOURWINE. We still do not have a yes or no answer to the question whether under my definition you as a member of the Communist Party were a conspirator.

Mr. MATUSOW. Along with conspiracy.

Senator EASTLAND. What was the definition?

Mr. SOURWINE. Using the word "conspirator" to mean a person who has joined with one or more others, in concerted action for the attainment of a common objective.

Senator EASTLAND. What was the question?

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you, as a member of the Communist Party, a conspirator?

Senator EASTLAND. I want you to answer that yes or no, and then you explain what you mean.

Mr. MATUSOW. All right, sir.

In that relationship I must answer the question "Yes." But as I have stated, that I believe the broadness of the definition should include and does include any two people who get together for any common goal.

Mr. SOURWINE. I did not quarrel with your definition.

Mr. MATUSOW. I just wanted the record straight. I did not say you did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, Mr. Matusow, what was or were the common objectives or objective with respect to you, regarding which you as a Communist were a conspirator?

Mr. MATUSOW. At one point, in 1947, I was a conspirator to try and lobby in any way, this is, by telegrams, petitions, to defeat universal military training.

Mr. SOURWINE. Give us another example.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was active in a campaign to save the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. SOURWINE. Give us another example.

Mr. MATUSOW. I was active in the campaign for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio to Congress for the 18th Congressional District of the City of New York.

Senator WELKER. What was that last answer, please?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was active in the campaign for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio in 1948.

I was active in the fight or in the campaign to end discrimination in the housing projects in New York commonly known as Stuyvesant Town, and I was active in the political campaign for New York City councilman, Benjamin Davis, Jr., also a Communist leader.

I was active in the organization of a labor youth league which had as its program one of the things that I believed in, the outlawing of all atomic weapons, an end to war.

I was active in various trade-union functions to get better working conditions, better wages in the newspaper industry, shorter hours, and better conditions for the newspaper reporter.

Very active there.

I marched many hours on the picket line at the New York World Telegram and Sun in 1950.

Those are just a few that I can recall.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you recall any others?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was active in the Advertisers Guild, trying to organize a union for copywriters and layout artists and junior account executives in the advertising industry in New York. I was a conspirator there.

Mr. SOURWINE. All of these, are they examples of your objectives as a conspirator in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead. Do you recall any more?

Mr. MATUSOW. I was active in a campaign at one time and I lobbied and came down here to the Senate Office Building, a crusade I think they called it, on Washington against the Mundt-Nixon bill—I think that was the purpose of the demonstration here in the Capital.

And I believe I was active in the 1949 campaign for election of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party ticket.

And I was active in the campaign to obtain subscriptions for the Daily and Sunday Worker.

I was active in the campaign to outlaw or to change the violation of the Smith Act that was charged against the first Communist Party leaders indicted.

I marched in the picket line at Foley Square.

I believe I was active on a picket line in June of 1949, in a picket line in front of the headquarters of the International Longshoremen's Association then headed by Joseph Ryan, in relation to, I think, that was local Brooklyn 948 which had seized the headquarters, and it was a question of discriminatory practices in the union, against this local which was a Negro local.

Mr. SOURWINE. These are all examples of your conspiratorial objectives as a conspirator in the Communist Party?

Mr. MATUSOW. To my understanding of your question, sir, they are.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, have you exhausted the list or—

Mr. MATUSOW. I have exhausted my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is obvious that you do have a recollection of substantial, a substantial number of the objectives of the Communist Party, even though many of those you have named were minor objectives.

Do you remember any of the major objectives of the Communist Party toward which you worked as a conspirator within that party?

Mr. MATUSOW. In your sense, in your definition, well, I can only think of specific events as I have just named.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wasn't it a major objective of the Communist Party to bring about ultimately a classless, godless, stateless world?

Mr. MATUSOW. Never heard it put that way, classless, godless, stateless world.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. That would be a good song for a musical comedy.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is no joke.

Mr. MATUSOW. I know it is not a joke but the rhyming just struck me as being funny—can't help but be.

Mr. SOURWINE. Let us get back to the question, don't you know that it is a major tenet of the Communist Party to work for the ultimate creation of a classless, godless, stateless world?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, I don't. I believed it when I left the Communist Party. Partly the reason that I left the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know that's one of the basic tenets of Marxism?

Mr. MATUSOW. As I said, sir, I believed it and that is why I left the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question is don't you know now that that is one of the basic tenets of Marxism?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believed it was one of the basic tenets of Marxism. From my own knowledge, I don't.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have read *Das Kapital* and the Communist Manifesto?

Mr. MATUSOW. Never said that I read *Das Kapital*. There are four volumes, too. To much for me to read.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have never read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I probably was not aiming to read four volumes of that stuff then.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you read an expurgated edition?

Mr. MATUSOW. The "Modern Library Edition" I glanced at, if that is what you are talking about.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer his question.

Mr. MATUSOW. I wanted to know if he was talking about—if his term meant the "Modern Library Edition" of volume 1 of *Das Kapital*.

Senator EASTLAND. Answer his question. You can answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, to my knowledge, no, unless he is referring to that edition, then yes. I have looked at it.

Senator EASTLAND. You read it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Looked at it, sir, not read it.

Senator EASTLAND. Did you read it? There is a difference between reading and looking at a book.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am only trying to establish, sir, whether you, the man who had a collection of what you have testified was several thousand books on Marxism and communism—

Mr. MATUSOW. Books and pamphlets is what I was testifying to.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't know that is a basic tenet of Marxism to work for the ultimate creation of a classless, godless, stateless world?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, in the absolute sense, "no." The word "know," k-n-o-w, I did not know it but I believed it, which is not quite as definite as the word "knowing."

Mr. SOURWINE. We are getting to something. We found that you had a peculiar definition of one word. What is your definition of the word "know" as you now use it?

Mr. MATUSOW. The definition of the word k-n-o-w in an absolute sense it means well, like "Don't ever say never again"—I try to not do that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't quibble.

Mr. MATUSOW. The question is, I believe certain things—

Mr. SOURWINE. No gobbledegook, when you use the word "know", what do you mean by k-n-o-w?

Mr. MATUSOW. That means that there is no getting away from it. It is there. It is an absolute fact. It is ironclad. There are no avenues of escape, are there?

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know as an absolute fact, ironclad and with no avenues of escape, that Karl Marx advocated and that Marxism advocates the ultimate creation of a godless, classless, stateless world?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. I only believe it. Which is very—

Mr. SOURWINE. Why do you believe it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because in something like this I might be proved wrong. I always leave that avenue open.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you believe it because you have read the works of Marx and that is what he said his theory was, isn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. To a great extent I read some of his works.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you talked with any persons known to you to be Communists within the last week?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Name some.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe a week ago on Wednesday I talked to Mr. Simon Gerson, said "Hello" to him in court.

I said "Hello" to the Daily Worker reporter whom I presume to be a Communist, Mr. Raymond, and I believe today at recess I said "Hello" to the Daily Worker reporter here in this room who is covering this hearing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who is he?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Berry. I presume he is a Communist. I do not know one way or another. I presume so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Anyone else?

Mr. MATUSOW. Nobody else who, to my knowledge, is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you state at a news conference in New York or elsewhere, that you had not been in contact with Communists since your expulsion from the party in January 1951?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't believe that was the question that was asked me and that was the answer. I believe that when asked have I been in contact with the Communist Party, and I asked the reporter "Do you mean have I been under party orders—have I been under party discipline?" And he said, "Yes." And I said "No, I have not been under party orders or discipline since that date."

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you appear on the program Douglas Edwards and the News on television 7:30 p. m. Wednesday, February 2, 1955?

Mr. MATUSOW. They might have used some film footage that was sought by CBS-TV but if it appeared on that show it is fine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you interviewed by CBS news for television?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was this?

Mr. MATUSOW. On two occasions. Wednesday, I believe it was the 2d of February. It was a Wednesday. I believe it was the 2d of February. And also Friday, the 4th of February.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who arranged that?

Mr. MATUSOW. CBS-TV News called and asked if they might shoot some film and I agreed to do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. They arranged it directly with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, my publishers—my publishers contacted me and said, "Are you willing to do it?" I said, "Yes."

Mr. SOURWINE. Who were present when you made that film for TV?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Phil Sheffler was the interviewer for CBS News and their technicians and Mr. Kahn was there, I believe, for part of the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did anyone tell you what to say?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, Mr. Sheffler asked certain questions and before answering them I went over the questions. Of course, I did not want to say certain things on the air at that time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you on that occasion state that you had appeared before McCarran, the McCarran committee about 5 or 6 times?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have said 5 or 6 times; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And did you state that there was "some fabrication" in each of your appearances before the McCarran committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I very possibly did say that, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that true?

Mr. MATUSOW. Very possibly so; yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. I insist that the answers are not correct answers. They call for "yes" or "no." He is evading; he is going around on every answer. He can say "Yes" or "No" very positively. If you don't remember, say so. Don't say "very possibly." That is not an answer.

Senator EASTLAND. Repeat the question.

Mr. SOURWINE. I asked Mr. Matusow if he had stated that there were some fabrications in his appearances before the McCarran committee.

Senator EASTLAND. Would you state that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so, that there are some.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that true? Did you in fact testify to some fabrications in each of your appearances before the McCarran committee?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe so, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Matusow, what press conferences have you held recently?

Mr. MATUSOW. Only one press conference. That was on Thursday, the 4th, I believe. Thursday, the 4th of February. Thursday, the 3d. Pardon me.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was on February 3, in 108 Biltmore Hotel, New York City, I believe at 2 o'clock. Who arranged that conference?

Mr. MATUSOW. My publishers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Kahn and Mr. Cameron?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Kahn and Mr. Cameron; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did Carl Marzani have anything to do with it?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my knowledge. He was present, but he had nothing to do with it, the arranging of the press conference.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was he present?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you know he is an official of the Liberty Book Club?

Mr. MATUSOW. You informed me of that; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you know at that time that he was an official of the book club that was going to distribute your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. I didn't know he was an official of Liberty Book Club.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you know he was an associate of your publishers?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew he was an associate of the firm of Cameron & Associates, but whether he was an official of Liberty Book Club, I was unfamiliar.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wasn't he present at your press conference as an official of the publishers?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't know, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who notified the press of that conference?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe my publishers did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know who paid for the room?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe my publishers did.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you went up there for that press conference, who went up there with you?

Mr. MATUSOW. Mr. Kahn and Miss Janice.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did they take you up?

Mr. MATUSOW. We went up together.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you get to the hotel building?

Mr. MATUSOW. Taxi.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were they with you in the taxi?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe Mr. Cameron was also in the cab.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Mr. Tank with you at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; he was on jury duty.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where was Mr. Marzani at that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Mr. Marzani was a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever know that Mr. Marzani had been convicted of a criminal offense?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew he was convicted; of what offense, I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. You do not know what the offense was?

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that it was contempt of the committee of Congress.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you assisted at your press conference on February 3 by Mr. Nathan Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. We went through that before. Somebody asked me—was it here or in Judge Dimock's court—if Mr. Witt had coached me on my answers. I don't recall any such thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. I did not say coached you on answers; I asked you if you were assisted by Mr. Witt at your press conference on February 3?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Witt was there?

Mr. MATUSOW. I seem to recall seeing him there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know why he was there?

Mr. MATUSOW. Haven't the slightest idea. He was interested in what I had to say, I guess.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew that Mr. Witt had agreed for the union—he represents the Mine, Mill, Smelter Union—he had agreed to purchase a certain number of copies of your book, did you not?

Mr. MATUSOW. I think I found it out that day or the day after; after the press conference.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you known Mr. Witt previously?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, I met him during the month of December and January of 1954-55. Respectively, that is, December 1954 and January 1955.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had you known him before that?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Witt to be a Communist?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. On May 26, 1953?

Mr. MATUSOW. What date? No, sir; I was unfamiliar with it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Nathan Witt was attorney for the Mine, Mill, Smelter Workers?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SOURWINE. When did you first meet Nathan Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. Formally or informally?

Mr. SOURWINE. Meet him at all?

Mr. MATUSOW. First time I saw him that I recall was on October 8, 1952, at the hearings held by this committee in Salt Lake City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you as a matter of fact, recognize him in the room at those hearings?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you point him out to another person and tell that other person who he was and what his relationship was to the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union?

Mr. MATUSOW. I might have done so after somebody else had pointed him out to me—Mr. Witt out to me—I might have relayed an identification.

Senator EASTLAND. Who pointed him out to you?

Mr. MATUSOW. The United States marshal might have pointed him out to me—one of the investigators—Dr. J. B. Matthews was with me, he might have pointed Mr. Witt out to me. And I think when I got in the hearing room, Mr. Witt had already been identified to me by somebody.

Senator EASTLAND. You do not remember who the person was?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who introduced you to Mr. Witt when you were first introduced to him?

Mr. MATUSOW. Introduced to him formally in December of 1954. The dates are a little—not clear.

Mr. SOURWINE. As to formal and informal introduction, you make a difference?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; all right. When I first met him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you make a distinction?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes; I know the difference between a formal and informal introduction.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is the difference?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, in this case, the difference is the informal was when I was on the attacking side of—when I was attacking Mr. Witt's client, Mr. Jencks. And the formal side was when I came to Mr. Witt and said, "I lied, I would like to help your client."

Mr. SOURWINE. Were you introduced to Mr. Witt at the time that you were attacking his client?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir. Well, I don't recall now whether the counsel for this committee introduced me to him over the committee table in Salt Lake City, but if that did not happen then, I had not been introduced to him.

Senator EASTLAND. Your testimony now—this is important—your testimony is that you had never seen Mr. Witt, never met Mr. Witt before the committee session in Salt Lake City.

Mr. MATUSOW. That is right, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. That he was pointed out to you there by some person, you do not remember who.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator EASTLAND. Now proceed.

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, just on the clarification there.

Senator EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MATUSOW. I testified on October 8, Mr. Witt might have been pointed out to me on October 7 or 6, that is, prior to my going in the hearing room but I say now, in this period, that it might have been a day or so earlier.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are uncanny. I was about to point out that during that hearing prior to the time Mr. Witt came into the room

you were around on counsel's side of the table and no one could have pointed out Mr. Witt but counsel. The hypothesis he might have been pointed out prior to that day is, of course, a logical explanation of why you were able to point him out on that day.

And we will move on.

Do you remember testifying that you had never looked at a copy of your testimony in the Flynn case until after you had talked to Mr. Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. I said, to my recollection, I had never looked at it, but I would like to correct the record right now on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was testimony that you gave in court, was it not, in Judge Dimock's court?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; and very suddenly just now my recollection has been refreshed.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is wonderful, let us get the record straight on the pertinent testimony that you gave in Judge Dimock's court.

Mr. MATUSOW. I have not said pertinent testimony. To the best of my recollection, during the month of December 1952, while accompanying Arvilla Bentley to Nassau, on Thanksgiving Day, to be exact, in 1952, I had in my brief case a copy of the testimony I had given in Judge Dimock's court—a copy which had been provided me by the United States attorney in New York because I was due to testify on a Monday following Thanksgiving. That was in my baggage and I did look at the testimony. To clear the record up that was the only other time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why did you tell Mr. Nathan Witt you were prepared to give an affidavit in the Flynn case?

Mr. MATUSOW. Because I was giving an affidavit in his case and I said, "Look, I am prepared to do that in the other case and if you know the attorneys tell them I am ready to give an affidavit."

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know of any community of interest between Mr. Witt and counsel in the Flynn case?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, the only community of interest I knew of there was one—yes, sir—that they both represented clients who had been prosecuted by testimony which was false and offered by me in courts of law.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you even know that they both represented clients who were Communists?

Mr. MATUSOW. I knew that the counsel for the Communist leaders represented Communist clients. Whether Mr. Witt has represented or does represent Communist clients, I do not know, sir. He might, but I don't know all of his clients.

Senator WELKER. I wonder if I could interrogate the witness with respect to his not liking the word "perjury."

Senator EASTLAND. Proceed.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Witness, I interrogated you at length a few hours ago; you did not hesitate at all to admit that you told whopping lies.

Mr. MATUSOW. I said "whoppers."

Senator WELKER. "Whoppers."

Mr. MATUSOW. That is what I said.

Senator WELKER. Lies and falsified under oath; you told me that you did not like to admit to the word "perjury."

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Senator WELKER. Do you know what the word "perjury" means? Mr. MATUSOW. I haven't seen any dictionary definition; no, sir.

Senator WELKER. I will read to you title 18, section 1621, of the United States Code Annotated, a definition of the word "perjury," and I quote:

Whoever, having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly, or that any written testimony, declaration, deposition, or certificate by him subscribed is true, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes to any material matter which he does not believe to be true, is guilty of perjury and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Do you have any argument with that definition of perjury, in the supreme law of the land, if you please?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, if that is the law, when you say title 18, code 1621 or something—

Senator WELKER. That is right.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, I haven't read that before. I knew what it was when you read it, though, that is, not in definition but in substance. And as I said, I don't use the term "perjury" because I told falsehoods, whoppers, lies—there are contradictory statements.

Senator WELKER. There is a difference between a "lie" under oath and the crime of "perjury."

Mr. MATUSOW. When, if the United States Government or any tribunal indicts me, if they do, and brings me to court, in relation to any crimes that I might have committed, at that point, sir, the question of your definition of what I have done according to title 18, section 1621 of the United States Code, and my definition of misstatements or whoppers, will be ironed out. Either I will be guilty or not guilty. The courts will determine that at such time as the case may be.

Senator WELKER. I thought I should correct your misstatement on whoppers, lies, falsehoods, as you have so testified under oath. I wanted to get your reaction just why you did not like the word "perjury."

Mr. MATUSOW. I think it is clear, sir.

Senator WELKER. I think it is, very clear.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I will wind up in about 10 minutes if I can have the cooperation of the witness to keep the answers as short as possible.

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did Mr. Albert Kahn introduce you to Mr. Witt in the fall of 1954?

Mr. MATUSOW. It might have been the fall or first few days of winter, it was in mid-December, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Had he told you before then that the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union were interested in your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. Interested in my book?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe he had said that the union was interested in my book, not in the sense of purchasing the book but interested in statements I made in the book which corrected misstatements I had made under oath.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was it that he told you that?

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't recall, sir. I haven't the slightest idea.

Mr. SOURWINE. Wasn't it the latter part of September?

Mr. MATUSOW. I never talked to Mr. Kahn in the latter part of September so it could not have been.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was it the latter part of October?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not to my recollection, sir, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you accept Mr. Kahn's recollection as to when it was?

Mr. MATUSOW. Not necessarily, unless he made some diary notation of it and it was a contemporary note; if that is the case, I will accept it.

Mr. SOURWINE. As a matter of fact, didn't Mr. Kahn tell you that the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union was interested in your book and that if it was—to the effect that if it was the right kind of a book, if it was what they thought it was going to be, they were going to buy a good many copies of it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not recall any such statements, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall testifying in Judge Dimock's court that Nathan Witt hoped there would be a chapter on the Jencks case?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe in substance; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. From whom did you learn this?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe from Mr. Witt.

Mr. SOURWINE. He told you so?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe from conversation—I do not think he just came out and said, "I hope you write a chapter on the Jencks case, but I have got this man"—because he did not talk to me that way—the first time he would not even discuss the Jencks case.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't Mr. Kahn tell you that Mr. Witt hoped that there would be a chapter on the Jencks case?

Mr. MATUSOW. In conversation at sometime with Mr. Kahn that might have come up, but I don't know if it did or did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you and Mr. Kahn decide that there should be a chapter on the Jencks case?

Mr. MATUSOW. I decided to write a chapter on the Jencks case without any coaxing from Mr. Kahn or Mr. Witt or anyone.

Mr. SOURWINE. But that was after Mr. Kahn had stated that he thought there should be and that Mr. Witt hoped there would be; wasn't it?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not think so, sir. I think you have got your chronology a bit backward.

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not asking what you think, sir. I am asking if you can testify as to facts.

Mr. MATUSOW. My recollection is that I decided without any hints or suggestion from Mr. Kahn or Mr. Witt or anybody else to write a chapter on the Jencks case.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was before anybody had said anything to you about such a chapter or Mr. Witt hoped that there would be such a chapter or Mr. Kahn thinking there should be such a chapter?

Mr. MATUSOW. Yes, sir; to my recollection that is the fact.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you communicate that determination to anybody prior to that time?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not know, sir. I believe in the first outline of my book there is mention of the Salt Lake City hearings, but it was not spelled out in relation to the Jencks case, et cetera.

Mr. SOURWINE. Isn't this true, that before you had completed writing your material about the Jencks case you had agreed to show Mr. Witt what you were going to write?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; that is not so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you so testify?

Mr. MATUSOW. I believe I testified that I was going to show Mr. Witt, and did show Mr. Witt the material I wrote about the Salt Lake City hearings, but that the material I wrote about the Jencks case I would not show him until after I decided to write an affidavit and that Mr. Witt would not discuss with me the material—in any way being influenced in anything I was going to say in that chapter or anything I was going to say in that affidavit.

Mr. SOURWINE. My question was, Isn't it true that before you had completed writing your material about the Jencks case, you had agreed to show Mr. Witt what you were going to write after it was written?

Mr. MATUSOW. I do not believe that is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I read to you from the transcript of your testimony in Judge Dimock's court, page 522 of the reporter's mimeographed transcript:

Question. Tell us what he said.

Answer. I believe he said to Mr. Witt that I wanted assurance from Mr. Witt that when he read the material relating to the Jencks case that I was planning to write, plus the material that I had already written, dealing with the hearings before the Senate committee in Salt Lake City—that I wanted Mr. Witt's assurance that he would not do anything with that material until I gave him permission to or without consulting me and getting my permission.

Now I ask you does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. MATUSOW. Well, sir—

Mr. SOURWINE. On whether—let me finish the question—

Mr. MATUSOW. I am sorry.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that refresh your recollection on whether it is true that before you had completed writing your material about the Jencks case you had agreed to show Mr. Witt what you were going to write?

Mr. MATUSOW. The thing is, I had agreed to show him what I was going to write but I thought you said before I finished it I showed it to him. I had agreed to show it to him; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is all I asked.

Mr. MATUSOW. Simple; yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Witt corrected your chapter of the Salt Lake City hearings, didn't he?

Mr. MATUSOW. In one respect, only, I believe that is in the record. I called it a national convention and he said legislative conference or some such other thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you represented by Mr. Witt's law firm?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is your present attorney a member of Mr. Witt's firm?

Mr. MATUSOW. He is not.

Mr. SOURWINE. He has offices with Mr. Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. He shares a suite of offices but is not in a law firm with him.

Mr. SOURWINE. He was recommended to you by Mr. Witt?

Mr. MATUSOW. He was, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Mr. Witt had conferred with Mr. Kahn in September, approximately a month before Mr. Kahn talked with you about your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. About the writing of the book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that before Mr. Kahn contacted you about writing your book, Mr. Witt had given a commitment of \$1,000 in funds from the Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers to purchase the book if it was written?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir; I did not know that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that Mr. Witt met with Kahn and Jencks in New York in early October about your book?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that at that meeting Mr. Witt agreed to pay \$250 toward the effort to get you to write the book whether or not you actually wrote it?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know that \$250 supplied the money for the tickets that brought you back to New York from New Mexico?

Mr. MATUSOW. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I have no more questions.

Senator WELKER. I would like to conclude with one question: I will ask you whether or not this statement on page 231 of your book, "False Witness," had anything to do with your writing this book and I quote:

I was looking for help, both moral and financial. I needed financial help to subsidize me in the writing of a book, and I contacted a number of publishers. They showed interest in the book but wanted part of a manuscript, a normal procedure. However, I could not write a manuscript and eat at the same time without financial help.

Did that motivate you in writing this book?

Mr. MATUSOW. The fact that I wanted an advance from the publisher, of course; the actual writing of the book had to be done with an advance.

Senator WELKER. As a matter of fact, you wanted financial help, didn't you?

Mr. MATUSOW. I have never denied that—that is true, sir.

Senator WELKER. Not only to eat but to live and to carry on your activities as an actor, wearing a mustache—

Mr. MATUSOW. I don't need financial help for that—in fact, it costs less—no razor blades.

Senator WELKER. That is all. No more questions.

Senator EASTLAND. We will recess now until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

(At 5:20 p. m. the hearing recessed to resume at 2 p. m. Wednesday, March 2, 1955.)







BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 2147





